







Z 190 d
BIBLIOTHÈQUE
"Les Fontaines"
S J
B - CHANTILLY



THE

BENGAL

CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

‘ One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.’

VOLUME I.

CALCUTTA:

PRINTED BY W. RUSHTON AND CO.

1839.



THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

'One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.'

No. I.

JULY 6, 1839.

VOL. I.

'Be not afraid of their fear, and be not troubled, but sanctify the Lord Christ in your hearts, being ready always to satisfy every one that asketh you a reason, of that hope which is in you. But with modesty and fear, having a good conscience; that whereas they speak evil of you, they may be ashamed who falsely accuse your good conversation in Christ.'—(1 Peter, III. 14, 15, 16.)

It is not in accordance either with the principles or the spirit of the Catholic Church to make harsh and bitter invectives against those, who, by misfortune of birth and education more than by wilfulness in error, are withdrawn from the pale of her communion, and from the unity of truth. If, amongst her opponents, she meets with impartiality and justice, she makes it a rule to avoid all direct and irritating attacks; and moving calmly along the path of peace, she does no more than hold up to each one the lamp of truth, and propagates her doctrines by the mild reflection of its rays. When indeed her tenets are assailed, she rises in her strength to defend them; but her language is temperate, because her arguments are solid. It is the province of falsehood, which hath no health and vigour within itself, to divert attention from its unsoundness by wanton attacks, unfounded assertions, and opprobrious calumnies. The Catholic Church, so spotless in her form, so rich in her resources, so firm on her foundation of rock, so irresistible in her proofs drawn from Scripture and Tradition, which mutually explain and strengthen each other, has no occasion for weapons, which would taint her character, and disgrace the sacredness of her cause. The shafts of calumny she leaves to her adversaries, who may want them; and whenever they are levelled against herself, she, like her Divine Master, is either silent, or speaks as having power to confute, and authority to condemn.

For several years now in India, the Catholic Church, who first in this soil planted the Gospel seed, and alone cultivated it with any kind of success, has borne in silent patience the most virulent attacks, made upon her by a race of new pastors, whose voice the flock should not hear, because they enter not by the gate. She has seen them breaking into her vineyard, though a wide field for exertion lay open for them without, and using their utmost efforts to remove or deface the land-marks, which she had fixed, to point out and designate the extent of her conquests. Unable to

cope with men, who, besides speaking a language unknown to her ministers, enjoyed the combined influence, which talent, riches and sovereign authority impart, she has long wept and mourned to observe her tender offspring inveigled from her arms, and nurtured in principles hostile to her faith ; to hear her sacred dogmas misrepresented and her ceremonies ridiculed as superstition ; to find doctrines attributed to her, which are inconsistent with the essential articles of her belief ; to behold the worst of motives imputed to her pastors, and the grossest idolatry to her flock ; to see in fine herself, though for ages the faithful guardian and depository of the Holy Bible, accused of horrid blasphemy in contemning it ; and though the mother of every church in the world, and the sole light which hath guided converted heathens out of the shadow of death, stigmatised and branded with epithets, which suitable only to the Prince of Darkness, Piety cannot hear without horror, nor Charity without tears.

These unwarrantable attacks have lately been renewed with greater vigour, and more systematic malignity. At such a juncture, to continue any longer silent is as inconsistent with the duty of the church, as it is repugnant to the spirit of her sons. We are now imperatively called upon to stand forth and defend her faith, not by imitating the modes of attack, by which we are ourselves assailed, but by stating our *real* doctrines, by supporting them with solid proofs, and refuting the objections that may be advanced against them. It is with this view that the '*Bengal Catholic Expositor*,' the first number of which we have now the honour to lay before the Public, has been set on foot and established under the authority and sanction of his Lordship the Vicar Apostolic of Bengal. Aware of the importance of the undertaking, but mistrustful of our own abilities in conducting it, we have yet entered upon the arduous duty with courage, and with hope. For we know that in the Catholic body of this city, there is a rich store of talent, learning and spirit, which we have only to solicit in order to command. Any contributions therefore agreeing with the character and principles of the publication, will be gratefully received.

Regarding the defence and exposition of Catholic Doctrine, as the primary and distinguishing feature of the work, we deem it proper to waive every political question, which does not bear directly upon the main object. Literary subjects that are brought to throw light upon it, will always find a glad reception in our pages ; for science and religion are closely allied, and walk hand-in-hand together with uninterrupted harmony. At the dissolution of the Roman Empire, when darkness had settled on the kingdoms overrun by the Northmen, it was the Catholic Church, that fed the lamp of science, and kept it burning in the silent cloisters of her monks. Its light each day grew brighter, in proportion as the Church brought the rude conquerors under the mild yoke of the Gospel ; till, at the close of the 14th century, when every nation of the West had entered into *the one fold of the one Shepherd*, there was not one that in some degree did not feel the influence of its beams. For, whilst the Catholic Church advanced, planting the banner of Christ over the ruins of Paganism, Science, who kept pace with her in her march of triumph, every where adorned and embellished her spiritual kingdom with the noblest productions of Genius. Catching her sublimest ideas from pure-eyed Faith which inspired her, she struck off and embodied each glowing image either in language, or on canvas, or in marble ; so that, whatever Genius composed, that was enchanting in Poetry, or in Eloquence persua-

sive, exact in Philosophy, or profound in Astronomy : whatever in the Arts was grand, beautiful, and majestic, either as to execution or design ; the awe-striking temples erected to the Deity, the simple and sublime strains of Music that echoed through their aisles, the life-breathing statues and paintings which at a glance brought to mind the dearest objects of Religion ;—works, which after a lapse of three centuries, still stand unrivalled ;—was all composed and wrought, either to ennoble the worship, to enliven the piety, or illustrate the belief of the Catholic Church. When her faithless sons, who brought about the Reformation, went forth from her pale, they wished to take Science with them, as the fairest advocate, and most winning pleader of their cause. But Science, which, in the works of Nature, loves and studies only Truth, seemed, with regard at least to the Fine Arts, to pine away and lose her vigour, when severed from the True Church ; which, being a nobler creation of Divine Wisdom than Nature, and more directly ordained for God's glory and man's sanctification, presents so vast a store of sublime objects, that, to express or embellish them, Genius has to exert all its energies, and exhaust whatever it finds grand and beautiful in Nature.

The defence of the Catholic Church is the chief object, which we have in view ;—an object that cannot fail to awaken the talent, and ensure the support of every sincere, and well informed member. Whatever therefore tends to elucidate, prove, and establish the faith and discipline of the ancient church ; whatever sets forth the admirable variety of its parts, and the beautiful simplicity with which they harmonize together, forming one faultless consistent structure of Divine Wisdom and Power, will have place in '*the Bengal Catholic Expositor*.' It is to be hoped, that, whilst such a paper is calculated to impart to Catholics a deeper and more extensive knowledge of the principles of their church, it will, in the minds of those who dissent from her, remove a mass of false notions as to the nature of her faith, and dispel the dark mists of prejudice, through which her discipline and her doctrine have been generally viewed.

Justice to our religion has forced us to appear before the public ; but in advocating her cause, it will be our fault, if we do not practically show forth this point of our belief ;—viz. that Truth and Charity are twin-born fires of heaven, and that the former never fully enlightens the understanding, unless the latter warm and expand the heart.

WHICH IS THE TRUE CHURCH ?

'How am I struck with admiration, when I consider the antiquity of the venerable Roman Church ; its vast extent, the majesty, the magnificence, the symmetry of its edifice, its immutable stability amid all the persecution it has undergone ; its admirable discipline ; the impotence of its adversaries, notwithstanding their sophistry, invectives and calumnies ; when I contemplate the dignity, the virtue, the talents of its apologists, and the vice and dishonesty of its first assailants, &c.' (A Protestant, the author of the '*Letters of Asticus*.)

Although the Christian portion of the world be so discrepant in matters of Religion, and split into so many sects, all at variance with each other, as to which is the true Church, still *we* do not discover the slightest difficulty in determining the question, and satisfying all who

admit the authority of the scriptures, that the *Roman Catholic* is theon ly true Church of Christ. However, while we undertake the demonstration of this proposition, we do not intend for the present entering into an elaborate disquisition of the subject ; we will not adduce all the arguments that may be brought forward to evince that the distinctive marks of Christ's Church, viz. Unity, Sanctity, Catholicity and Apostolicity, appertain exclusively to ours, nor will we at the outset annoy our readers with a prolix enumeration of scriptural texts, and a long string of traditional authorities in support of our assertion : we will content ourselves with a simple line of argument, is as unravalled as it is conclusive. Our separated brethren, in order to demonstrate the corruption and downfal of our Church, *assert*, that she has invented dogmas and adopted practices discordant with the word of God, and with the doctrines of the primitive Church ; and thus make use of an argument, which we may entitle a *posteriori*. We then do not consider ourselves swerving from a sound theological method while adopting an argument *a priori* to rebut their attacks. Our object is to evince from sacred Scripture and from sound reason, that Christ our Lord established a Church, to which he imparted the prerogatives of indefectibility and *inerrancy*, or *infallibility* in dogmas of faith, and then from these premises to draw the legitimate conclusion that *such* a Church, so established and endowed, could *never* have fallen into error, *without* we pretend to question the veracity as well as the omnipotence of Christ, seeing that *he* promised she should *never* fail, and that he would assist her *until the world is no more*.

We pledged ourselves then, in the first place, to demonstrate that Christ established a Church which he endowed with the prerogatives of indefectibility and infallibility. In the Gospel of St. Matthew, he thus promises : ' I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' (Matt. XVI. 18.) Now, no body, we presume, will dispute, that by those words our Redeemer meant that all the powers of hell itself, that all the illusions of Satan and of his diabolical envoys should not succeed in demolishing the grand fabric, that he intended erecting on the rock of Bar-Jona. No body will call in question that in those words he alluded to *spiritual* assaults, no others being capable of overthrowing a *spiritual* edifice. Hence then we conclude, (and we beg our readers, our impartial though separated friends, to ponder the conclusion) that if, as they maintain, the Church of Rome, which by their concession remained the *true* one for the first five centuries, had sunk at *some* after-period into an abyss of superstition and idolatry, the gates of hell *would* have prevailed against the *true* Church, yea, against *that* Church, which Christ had pledged himself should be impregnable, and with which he promised to remain till the end of time.* In a word the blasphemous consequence would follow, that Christ has been *unfaithful to his promises* ; and that the gates of hell *have* prevailed against his Church, notwithstanding the security given by *him* to the contrary.

But if the scriptural passage of St. Matthew clearly demonstrates the *indefectibility* of the Church, another contained in St John no less manifestly evinces her perpetual *infallibility*. ' And I will ask the Father (says our Redeemer, John XIV. 16 and 17) and he shall give you another

* We say *some* period, because our adversaries are unable to assign a *fixed* one, contenting themselves with generalities.

Paraclete, that he may *abide with you for ever* : The Spirit of truth *he shall abide with you and shall be in you,* and v. 26. 'The Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you *all things* whatsoever I shall have said unto you.'

From these words we thus argue : Christ here promised his apostles (the teaching Church) that the Holy Ghost would instruct them in all *his* doctrines, and guide them in the exercise of their apostolic functions *for ever* ; which latter words denote that the assistance of the Holy Ghost was to extend to their *lawful* successors, otherwise not even the hierarchy of the established Church could claim to possess any spiritual jurisdiction. Now if the primitive Church had been debased by corruptions, if it had taught any errors against faith or good morals, if it had ever admitted any superstitious or idolatrous practice, the Holy Ghost would *not* have instructed it in *all* Christ's doctrines, he would *not* have been *with it*, and *in it*, he would have failed 'to abide with it *for ever*.'—It is therefore impossible to suppose that the Church *could* have *ever* ceased to teach the true doctrines of Christianity, it is impossible that it *could* have *ever* been defiled by idolatry, or by any other superstition, unless we question the veracity of Christ. If then such a defection from the truth be impossible *a priori*, i. e., arguing from the very *nature* of the institution of the church, *as established* by Christ our Lord, and from the blasphemous absurdity of his sacred promises being capable of failing, it manifestly follows that the church *has never* failed in reality, and consequently, that the Church of Rome, which our heterodox opponents themselves allow to have been the primitive and true one, still continues to be identical with that of the apostolic ages, still perseveres the same as when founded, still endures the TRUE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

It is false then that *transubstantiation* is a compound of idolatry and superstition ; false that *purgatory* is a human invention, false that the Sacrament of Penance of which *Confession* is a part, is an earthly institution ; false that *indulgences* are the offspring of priestcraft ; false, to be brief, that any of the dogmas or rites impugned by our separated brethren, but upheld by the Church of Rome, are in discordance with the doctrines of Christ. All these falsities have been demonstrated *a priori*.

Hence let it not be here objected that if our Lord promised that his Church should be infallible, he also forewarned us against a defection from the truth : He foretold that false christs and false prophets would rise up in the middle of his Church ; so that to suppose such a failure does not clash with his veracity. But away with sophistry and quibbling. We admit that our Lord predicted such events as the appearance of false prophets, &c. ; but he never foretold, that the *whole* Church would have abandoned the true faith : on the contrary, he purposely cautioned his Church against adopting the errors of those innovators, and would-be reformers. If a few or even a great minority of its members forsake the path of truth, allured by the love of novelty, and perhaps fascinated by the attracting eloquence of those false preachers, their apostasy does not affect the indefectibility of the Church. In a temporal sovereignty, if a *portion* of the people and even of the ministers become rebellious that does not make the *entire* kingdom revolutionary. We may then well assail our adversaries with their own weapons, and say that the prediction of our Lord was perfectly verified by the *rising up* of an Arius and a Macedo-

nius, a Luther and a Calvin. Furthermore let our opponents bear in mind, that so far from the *entire* Church having failed in professing the true faith, while a portion of it is by themselves affirmed to have remained always a staunch adherent to Christ's doctrine, the archpatriarch of the so called Reformation, MARTIN LUTHER himself, declared, that when he commenced the glorious work of the Reformation, *the entire Church was against him*. Which then was the case? was it, the church revolted from Luther, or Luther from the Church? The reply is obvious, unless they pretend that the majority at least of the Church was *embodied in the person* of the apostate monk.

But let us defend ourselves at our opponents' cost. They (as well as we) maintain that the Bible is the word of GOD, because written by inspired authors. But how are they assured of its divine origin? How are they certain that it is inspired? Is not the sole foundation of their certainty their having received it from the Catholic Church? Now if that Church be liable to err, how do they know but she may have erred in upholding the inspiration of the Bible? And let them not say that its divinity is based on the perpetual tradition of all ages. For besides that it is a piece of inconsistency to have recourse to tradition in one instance, while they reject it in others, that may prove in favor of the Old Testament, the inspiration of which was venerated by the members of the elder dispensation; but it evinces nothing about the divine origin of the New. For let them not pretend that as the unanimous consent of all ages demonstrates the authenticity, for example, of Cicero or of Virgil, it evinces in like manner the divinity of the sacred volume.—It may prove that the Gospels were *composed* by Mathew, Mark, Luke and John, but it will never evince that Mathew, Mark, Luke and John, were *inspired* by the Holy Ghost, when they wrote the Gospel. The divine origin of the Bible cannot be ascertained, but from an infallible authority: so that while our separated friends reject all infallibility, not even claiming it for their own Church, they subvert the fundamentals of Biblical inspiration.

Having then, we trust, satisfactorily, evinced *from scripture alone* the indefectibility and infallibility of the Catholic Church, let us now proceed to show that those prerogatives are perfectly conformable to the dictates of sound reason, of reason based on the foundation of faith. We believe that we mean, God in his mercy has been pleased to reveal a religion to mankind, threatening at the same time that whosoever refuses to believe it, is doomed to everlasting tortures. Is it then possible to suppose, that he inexorably demands the belief of all men, without assigning an unerring guide, who may point out to them, without fear of being misled, which, among so many hundred sects, is that which leads to salvation? Would not this be (what it is absurd to suppose in God) to wish the attainment of the end without furnishing the means? But, we are told, that he has given the Bible for our guide. Is it so? Is the Bible such a guide as is required? How then does it come to pass, that the identical Bible guides people in opposite directions? Thus, nobody will question that the institution of the Blessed Eucharist is a point of high importance, being connected with the person of our Redeemer himself. Now the same words of the Bible, 'This is my body,' are understood by the Protestants in one sense, and by the Catholics in a meaning diametrically opposite. If the Bible then be the infallible guide assigned by God to teach us the true religion that he revealed, why does it not decide the controversy between the Protes-

tants and Catholics ? We may be answered, it is because the Catholics are obstinate in misinterpreting those words, contrary to the bearing of all *parallel* passages, and consequently err wilfully. But waving the question of *parallel passages*, (which we deny are favorable to our opponents' interpretation) do not the Protestants allow to *all* the right of private judgment ? Have not the Catholics then an equal *jus* to take the words alluded to in their *obvious* meaning as the Protestants have to interpret them *figuratively* ? Who then is to settle the case ? If the Bible be the unerring guide, why does it not decide between us ? No, the Bible is a dead letter, it cannot judge, and we are thus left, in the opinion of our separated friends, destitute of a beacon to conduct us to the port of truth !

In such a state of things, we should be in a condition far inferior to that of our Mosaic brethren prior to the coming of the Messiah. They, when led astray by the love of heathenism and superstition, had the fortune to be visited by men of God, who were specially deputed by him to reclaim them from their evil ways. Further those envoys, unlike the prophets of the *soi-disant* Reformation, used always to confirm their mission by the working of miracles, and thus to convince the stray sheep of Israel that it was their heavenly Shepherd who had sent them to reconduct them to his fold ; but, in the opinion of our separated brethren, we Christians are by no means so well provided for. We are continually forsaking the path of truth, we have already split ourselves into a thousand fragments each of these divisions claims truth to be on its side, and there is no prophet to indicate to us the right road ! Is this Christianity ? Is this the improvement that we boast over Judaism ? Is it thus that the ' desired of all nations' has bettered the state of mankind ? Has not Religion thus retrograded, in place of advancing ?

But let us join issue more closely. The Protestants venerate, as well as we, the four first General Councils, of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon, by which Arius, Macedonius, Nestorius, and Eutyches were condemned and excommunicated. Now as each of those Councils represented the Universal Church, if the latter be not infallible, neither were those councils. Hence their decision regarding those heresiarchs *might have* been erroneous, and consequently any or all of them might justly have proclaimed against their condemnation. It was precisely for this reason that Luther resisted the Council of Trent, and surely Arius enjoyed an equal right to oppose that of Nice.

Here we may animadvert on the inconsistency of the Church of England. She draws up thirty-nine points, which, and which *alone*, she proclaims articles of *necessary* faith, and compels all her Prelates not only to subscribe to them, but even to *swear* to uphold them ; and this, at the very instant she denies she is infallible ! She then *may err* in teaching what those articles contain, and still she enforces their belief ! She *may err* in limiting the number of *necessary* articles to thirty-nine, or in declaring that they amount to that number, and still she defines that neither *more* nor *less* than thirty-nine articles are to be believed ! Further she allows to all her members the right of *interpreting* the Bible as they please (*this* is what the Catholic Church forbids to her children, and not the simple *reading* of the scriptures as our opponents would have it), and in the same breath, with the same ink she commands them to *submit their private judgment* to the articles of faith that *she* has framed ! Will any enlightened, unprejudiced Protestant call this consistency ? Surely, any member of that church, if condemned

for broaching any new dogma, might justly remonstrate with her in the language of those who were excommunicated by the Synod of Dort. 'Why exact that *our* judgment should yield to *your* opinion? Why exercise a dominion over us which you stigmatise as tyranny in a church,* compared with whose greatness you dwindle into insignificance? If there be any crime in resisting the decisions of our Pastors, then are you, and we, and all of us, guilty of resisting the authority of the Church of Rome, which existed before us, and of which our fathers were a portion You object that *our* doctrine is contrary to the word of God, and we assert that it is *yours* that is repugnant to it.'—Thus those men ably advocated the cause of Protestant liberty, and all situated without of the pale of the Catholic Church at the present day enjoy the same right to reclaim, because *she alone* claims the prerogative of infallibility.

In conclusion, we may add, that this prerogative of the church is so indispensable a requisite in affairs of religion, that the first Reformers themselves acknowledged that the Bible was not a sufficient guide in them. Thus Dudith addressed his friend Beya, and we think we cannot more appropriately conclude than by adducing his authority :

'You conclude that the scriptures are a perfect rule of faith. But you are, all of you, divided about the sense of them. Neither have you as yet settled who shall be the judge. You say one thing: Stancarus says another: you quote the Bible, he quotes the Bible: you reason, he reasons: you require of me to believe you; but why should I trust you rather than Stancarus? You say he is a heretic, but the Catholics say you are both heretics. Whom then shall I believe? Who is the Judge? you have thrown off the yoke, allow me to throw of mine. You say I am no prophet, I say you are none. Having freed yourselves, as you call it, from tyranny, why do you turn tyrants yourselves, and even more cruel tyrants than were those, against whom you so violently declaim?'

Such of our readers as may have seen Mr. John Poynder's work entitled 'Popery in alliance with Heathenism,' a publication betraying the grossest ignorance of the tenets of the Catholic religion, will, we are confident, be glad to peruse the reply of Dr. Wiseman, Professor in the University of Rome, in a series of four letters; the first of which will be found among our excerpts in the present number. We likewise call attention to a short article entitled PROTESTANT RECOMMENDATIONS, which, if contrasted with the ravings of some, who have recently in this metropolis, unfurled the banners of bigotry and fanaticism, must place the talents and learning of the NEW LIGHTS in no enviable position. Let our readers also bear in mind, how the 'Champions of different religious denominations' have, with true Christian spirit and meekness, given vent to their acrimonious feelings in misrepresenting the faith of Catholics, and then let them turn to the recent declaration of the Catholic Bishops in Great Britain; for only a portion of which we have been able to find space in our present issue. We are however aware, that to several of our Catholic readers, the declaration will not be new, but our object in re-publishing it, is to afford to the reasonable and thinking portion of our separated brethren, an opportunity of learning what is, and has always been, the faith of Catholics.

* Viz. the Catholic.

CALCUTTA CATHOLIC BOOK SOCIETY.

We have much pleasure in bringing this useful institution to the notice of our readers. It was established about two years ago under the auspices of Dr. St. Leger and the clergy of this mission, chiefly for the purpose of providing this community with 'a constant and abundant supply of Catholic Books of devotion, and of moral and religious instruction, which were to be disposed of on the lowest terms, and to be given gratuitously to those who could not afford to purchase them.' It was intended to make it a branch of the Catholic Book Society of Ireland, on the basis of which it was modelled, but nothing has yet been settled in this particular. A fund was created by subscriptions raised among a few individuals. This enabled the Society to commission out a large supply of Catholic Works which, owing to unforeseen but unavoidable delays, have only lately arrived. The avidity with which these books have been sought for, notwithstanding complaints of the high prices fixed on some of them, is the best evidence of the utility and necessity of this institution, which well deserves the support and patronage of the Catholic Community in general. We should observe, in justice to the Society that, although from their limited resources they have not been able to be very liberal to purchasers in general, the military and others who cannot well afford to purchase at the prices fixed in the published list, are dealt with on very favorable terms. His Lordship Dr. Taberd, Vicar apostolic of Bengal, is the Patron of the Society at present.

Selections.

THE ALLIANCE BETWEEN POPERY AND HEATHENISM.

Letter I.—Dr. Wiseman to Mr. Poynder. (Ed. Lond., 1839.)

SIR,—An article in the *Times* newspaper lately called my attention to a work published by you, purporting to establish 'the alliance between Popery and heathenism;' and though, from the copious extracts in that journal, I at once saw that you had but given the repetition of a twice-told tale, I was induced to procure your book, and run over its pages. Although occupied with other matters more congenial to my taste, and, I trust, more beneficial to my fellow-Christians than this effusion of your zeal, I have agreed to devote a few hours to record the impression which it has produced upon me, and appeal to your own good taste and undoubted erudition, on the propriety of the course, and the validity of the arguments, which you have thought proper to pursue.

The first feeling excited in me, was one not of admiration, but of wonder, at the rich diversity, and marvellous ways, whereby the spirit of charity manifests itself in this country. I had long heard of you in my foreign residence, as of one who devoted his energies to the abolition of self-immolation in India, whose eloquence and learning, inspired by humanity, had striven to snatch the deluded widow from sharing her husband's pyre. But after this long struggle to abolish the suttee in distant lands, you have resolved to escape from the censure too often cast upon your friends—of going to the east and to the west for objects of charity, while your fellow-subjects were suffering around you; of subscribing to the relief of any victim to inundation in India, while an entire population at your side was writhing under, what Calderon so nervously calls, 'the wooden knife of hunger;' and you have

now come forward to pour out among your fellow-christians of Britain the sweet abundance of fraternal love, which had so long felt no sympathy but for the Ganges or the Burrampooter. But how Proteus-like are the changes which the same spirit of charity doubtless undergoes! You appear before the public no longer as anxious to extinguish the willing flames which the Indian widow covets; but, on the contrary, with holy zeal, you snatch up a torch, which long has been smouldering, qualified and directed to put in a blaze the bigotry and fanaticism of one party, and with it the bitter indignation and outraged feelings of another, such as may, like the apocalyptic brand, scorch or turn to worm-wood, the holy and beautiful fountains of social and friendly intercourse, at which men of all opinions have for a long time drunk together; and yet doubtless, in the estimation of your pious zeal, this is but a prelude and a foreshowing of the lot which idolaters must elsewhere expect.

All this is assuredly, as you tell us in your preface, exceedingly charitable, 'for a feeling Christian will express in his words and character of zeal and love,' (p. 9.) and becomes doubly interesting from seeing how, after having through one hundred and fifteen pages called Catholics in every line idolaters, and us of the priesthood cheats, your feelingly and movingly complain, 'with what injustice the Church of Rome charges her younger sister, the Protestant Church, with heresy!' (p. 115.) Little was I prepared for such gentle, fondling expostulation as this; little could I have thought that you held the right of calling names so exclusive a monopoly; that you cared about being considered a heretic by idolaters, or claimed any compassion at our hands. But, Sir, allow me to say, that in the publications of Catholics, or in their sermons, you will not find the name of *heretic* applied to Protestants, however we may consider their doctrines heretical,—and observe there is a great difference between the two;* while you in every page of your work call us personally idolaters; and that were any one amongst us to call down the fire of heaven—as you have done—upon any of our fellow-subjects, who should say to him, as was said to others of old:—'Ye know not of whose spirit ye are.'

But, to descend from the spirit to the substance of your work, the next impression produced on me in reading it, was a sense of its excessive deficiencies. I was surprised, how, after taking such great pains, as obviously you have done, with the resemblances between our religious practices and those of others in the ancient and modern world, you have added so little that is new, and overlooked so many coincidences which I think very remarkable. For instance, the custom of hanging the exterior of churches with boughs on festivals, as described by Virgil,—

Non delubra Deum, miseri quibus ultimus esset
Ille dies festa velamus fronde per urbem;

the practice of confession, which Volney maintains to have prevailed in Greece; the form of the sacerdotal vestments, in which the cope or pluviale is manifestly the Roman dress, with the *latus clavus* on its front, and the amice or *amictus*, drawn over the head in some religious orders when proceeding to the altar, manifestly recalls the veiling of the priests' heads in former times, when going to sacrifice,—though, by the bye, copes and hoods are most severely enjoined by the canons of the Church of England to be worn in all cathedral churches and college chapels;†—these, and many other peculiarities which I omit, would have greatly enriched your cabinet of comparative religious anatomy, and relieved the monotony of reading 'Middleton' over again. Indeed, I am at a loss to account for your omission of the many rich gleanings which Mr. Blunt would have supplied, and for his work not being honoured by incertion in the edifying list of fellow-labourers at the end of your work.

But one new element you have collected, and for it, a little later, I shall thank you from my heart—a comparison of our rites and practices with those of India: at present I have only to complain, that your additions of this cha-

* See St. Chrysostom Hom. ii. de Inc. Nat.

† Constitutions and canons ecclesiastical. § 24. Lond. 1827.

racter have been so scanty. Why not discover some resemblance between us and the Ghebers, which you might easily have done by a few snatches of some of our service? Why not compare our rosary to that of the dervishes, our reliquaries to the fetiches of Africa, our exorcisms to the shamanisms of Tartary? How did you overlook the Grand Lama and his consistory, and the bells on his churches, and the dresses of his priests, and the splendour of his worship; or the Talapoins of Ava, with their noviciate, and profession, and holy vows of poverty? For I can hardly believe that the researches and discoveries of Abel Remusat or Pitchaurinsky would have deterred you from so happy and detailed a comparison. And having now extended our connexion so far towards the East, how did you overlook the new and striking analogies to be found in the western hemisphere, among the original inhabitants of America? If you had looked into old Acosta, though a Jesuit, you would have seen, in the second part of his *Historia natural y moral de las Indias*, a chapter on the confession practised by the Mexicans, and another on their communion; as well as a notice of many other practices most obstinately Catholic. Or if you would consult the splendid work on Mexican antiquities published by Aglio, under the munificent auspices of Lord Kingsborough, you would find a very long essay upon this subject, showing such resemblances as lead the author to conjecture that Christians must have settled in America, long before its discovery by Columbus.

Thus you see, Sir, that I do not shrink from the species of enquiry in which you have indulged, but that I am quite willing to lend my feeble aid towards preventing any other gentleman having to trouble himself with completing what you have begun, and thus to keep our literature unstained by any more names connected with so ungodly a work of zeal! But while I have thus pointed out to you these imperfections in your work and communicated to you some little additional information upon its subject, I must not conclude this letter, without thanking you for the much I have learnt from you, concerning matters on which I had till now considered myself tolerably well informed.

I did not know, till I read your work, that holy water was supposed by us to have the power of washing out murder, as your most pertinent quotation from Ovid teaches me. (p. 20) Neither was I aware, till I there learnt it, that it possesses a narcotic power, and is used to send persons to sleep. (p. 97) Nay to own my ignorance to the full, I did not know that it was at all usual to administer it internally; of which points I think the next edition of the pharmacopœias should have the advantage.

Though I have lived more than half my life in Rome, there are a great many particulars touching its antiquities and customs for which I am indebted exclusively to your book. Thus, I never had heard of the '*Maria in triviti*,' (p. 32) so common all over the country; and though very familiar with the peasantry, and accustomed to see them pass in crowds every day, when in the country, before the 'wooden crosses or rustic chapels (notaltars) at the entrance of their villages, I never saw them indulge in 'genuflection and prostration as they passed them,' though perhaps they may touch their hats in token of respect; nor did I ever learn that 'the poor unenlightened postillions would think they deserved to be murdered before the end of their journey, if they should omit the accustomed acts of piety prescribed by their priests.' (p. 32) Does this mean that the postillions genuflect or prostrate before every cross they meet on the road? I have often seen the church of St. Agnes, and the beautiful statue of the saint to which you allude; (p. 41) but I think it would perplex a Phidias to convert a jovial statue of Bacchus, as you say was done, 'by a little change of drapery,' which in ancient Bacchuses is rather scanty, into the modest and touching virgin, standing amidst the flames, with eyes and hands lifted up to heaven. But, pray Sir, have you not been puzzling yourself with the statue of St. Sebastian on the opposite altar, which is so exquisite a work of art, that some have conjectured it may once have been an Apollo? The same is to be said of the two Jupiters changed into St. Peters—one by having a new head, and a pair of keys instead of a thunderbolt; the other by being re-cast. This is all new information for the Roman antiquaries, who have never, till

now, confirmed this tradition of the *valets de place*; for I suppose only they can have told the tale of the change of heads. (p. 41) Your informant, I fear, has mistaken the measurements of St. Leo's altar in St. Peter's, for it is no larger than any of the rest; and in his horror of looking on idols, has transformed SS. Peter and Paul into one angel driving away Attila. (p. 55) Perhaps it was the same fear of too narrowly searching into Popish things which led you to place St. Winefred's well in Staffordshire. (p. 103) You cannot have read the book which you so severely censure.

I have never met the 'prayer in the Romish books of offices, ordered by the rubric to be addressed to the sacred and miraculous picture of St. Veronica;' (p. 43) although tolerably conversant with all the rubrics and books of offices. But even if what you say be correct, it is only necessary to understand it rightly to be satisfied. Again, though I have read a good deal on the subject, I never knew, till now, that to be canonized a person must have wrought miracles while living; (p. 33) or that 'the creation of saints has become almost as common as that of cardinals;' (p. 35) for I have seen some scores of cardinals made in my life, but not *one* saint canonized.

But the most important accession of knowledge which I have received from your leared work, concerning my religion, is the astounding fact that 'confession has a prospective efficacy in reference to sins about to be committed, as well as those which have occurred already.' The only open, or, as we call it, scholastic question on the subject, seems to be, according to your information, whether penance has not the same efficacy too. (p. 71.) Here have I been brought up since a child to the practice of this duty, and not one of my teachers ever had the kindness or the sense to tell me this most useful prerogative of confession. And what has been the necessary consequence of such stupidity?—why, that I have been teaching and directing others for years, and have been always saying exactly the contrary to what you now tell me is the doctrine of my Church. And I fear the evil is now past remedy; for I find that all my fellow-clergymen have been kept in the same ignorance with myself, and teach the same doctrines as I do on the subject.

Do I blame you, Sir, for being ignorant upon such matters, as our belief concerning holy water or confession?—Certainly not: but I blame you severely for writing on subjects whereon you are ignorant. If a blind man goes abroad into the streets, and stumbles against me, and injures me as well as himself, I do not chide him for being blind, but for not getting some one,—at least a child, to guide his steps. Now, Sir, this is precisely your case, and so do I say to you: why did you not ask for some boy who frequents our charity schools, or has learnt his catechism, to inform you on these subjects? Even he, Sir, could have taught you better. I am, &c.

DECLARATION OF THE CATHOLIC BISHOPS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

SECTION I.

On the General Character of the Doctrines of Faith, professed by the Catholic Church.

THE doctrines of the Catholic Church are often characterized as *erroneous, unscriptural, and unreasonable.*

All these doctrines, and only those doctrines, are articles of Catholic faith, which are revealed by Almighty God.

Whatsoever is revealed by God, who knows all things, as they are in themselves, and who cannot deceive us, by teaching falsehood for truth, is most true and certain; though it may entirely surpass the comprehension of created minds.

On the authority of divine revelation, the Catholic believes, as doctrines of faith, that in one God there are three distinct persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; that Jesus Christ, who died on the cross for the salvation of

all mankind, is the second person of the Blessed Trinity, true God and true Man; that there is no remission of sin, nor salvation but through him; that the sacraments of baptism and penance are divinely appointed means for the remission of sin; that in the mass, a true, proper and propitiatory sacrifice is offered for the living and the dead; that the souls detained in purgatory are helped by the suffrages of the faithful; that the saints reigning together with Christ, are to be honoured and invoked; that at the last day our bodies will be raised from death, and that Christ will come to judge all men according to their works; that eternal happiness will be the reward of the good, and eternal misery the punishment of the wicked.

If these, and other doctrines of Catholic faith, are really revealed by Almighty God, they are not erroneous, but most true and certain—they are not unscriptural, but agreeable to the true sense of the written word of God—the belief of them is not unreasonable, because it is reasonable to believe whatever is true, and taught by the God of truth.

The Catholic is fully persuaded that all the articles of his faith are really revealed by Almighty God.

Is he not at liberty to think so, as well as others that think the contrary; and in this empire especially, where liberty of thought is so loudly proclaimed and lauded? Is it reasonable or charitable to condemn him for thinking so, when he may have good and solid grounds for his conviction, and may feel that his eternal salvation depends on his firm belief of all the doctrines which Christ has taught?

SECTION II.

On the grounds of the certitude which a Catholic has, that all the Doctrines which he believes, as articles of Catholic Faith, are really revealed by Almighty God.

CATHOLICS are often charged with grounding their faith on mere human authority, and not on the word of God.

Catholics deny this, because they are convinced, that their faith is grounded on the word of God, proposed to them by the authority of that ministry which Christ established, and appointed to teach his revealed doctrines to all nations.

The Catholic believes all those doctrines which God has revealed.

The question, *what* are those doctrines, which God has revealed, is a question of FACT. It appears reasonable that the existence of a *fact* should be ascertained by the evidence of *testimony*.

The body of the doctrines, precepts, and institutions, which were delivered by Christ to his apostles, constitutes the new or the Christian law; as the body of the doctrines, precepts, and institutions, which were delivered by the Almighty to Moses, constituted the old law.

The true and certain knowledge of what is commanded by any law, is generally communicated and obtained by the authoritative *promulgation* of the law.

By the ordinance of God, the doctrines and precepts of the old law were made known to the Israelites, and Jewish people, by Moses, and the priests in succession, till the end of the law.

By the ordinance of God, the doctrines and precepts of the new law were to be made known to all nations, in all ages, by the apostles and their successors to the consummation of the world.

On the spiritual authority of the apostles and their successors, who were divinely commissioned to promulgate and teach the law of Christ to all nations; and on the uniform and universal testimony, belief, and practice of all Christian churches from the beginning, the certitude of the Catholic is grounded, that all the doctrines which he believes, as articles of Catholic faith, and all the sacred precepts and rites which he observes, as the ordinances of Christ, were really revealed and instituted by Almighty God; and are the same as were originally delivered by Christ to his apostles, and by them promulgated over all nations.

The Catholic is fully satisfied, that this method which he follows, for ascertaining *what* are the revealed doctrines of divine faith, is the right rule, and that it leads him to the unity of truth.

Is he not at liberty to follow a rule which gives such satisfaction and security to his mind?

Is it fair for others who, by following a rule, are led into a countless variety of contradictory doctrines on matters of Christian belief, to disturb the tranquility of the Catholic on this head, or to condemn him for his submission to the authority of a ministry, which he is convinced was established by Christ for the purpose of bringing all nations to the certain knowledge of his law, and to the unity of faith? Is not this rule perfectly natural and reasonable? Can any human legislator condemn the principle and rule of the Catholic in this regard?

To be continued.

PROTESTANT RECOMMENDATIONS IN FAVOUR OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

In writing against the Anabaptists, Luther, the father of the Reformation, thus delivers himself: 'Under the Papacy are many good things; yea, every thing that is good in Christianity. I say, moreover, that under the Papacy is true Christianity, even the very kernal of Christianity.'

The learned Hooker, in his Ecclesiastical Polity, observes, that 'the Church of Rome is no doubt to be attributed a part of the house of God; and we gladly acknowledge them to be of the family of Jesus Christ.'

And Bishop White, in his Defence of his Way, p. 356, says, 'I have never doubted the Church of Rome to be the visible Church of God, wherein our ancestors did profess the true faith, and were saved.'

Docter Baro, (Sermon 3.) 'I dare not deny the name of Christians to the Romanists, the most learned Protestants having owned the Church of Rome to be the Church of God.'

'In the judgement' (says Dr. Some in his Defence against Penry,) 'of all learned men, and of all Reformed Churches, there is a Popery, a church, a ministry, a true Christ. And if you think that all of the Popish sort who died in the Popish Church are damned, you think absurdly, and dissent from the judgment of the learned Protestants.'

'Though I sincerely blame the imposing new articles on the faith of Christians, yet I must, and do truly profess, that I find no position necessary to salvation prohibited, none destructive to salvation enjoined to be believed by the Church of Rome; and therefore I most necessarily accept it for a true Church, as in the Church of England I have always known it accepted; seeing there can be no question made but that it continueth the same visible body by the succession of bishops and laws that were first founded by the apostles. There remains, therefore, in the present Church of Rome, the profession of all faith necessary for the salvation of all Christians to believe, either in point of faith or manners.'—Thorndyke, Epilogue p. 146.

'There are (says the very learned and celebrated Jeremy Taylor) 'many considerations which may retain many persons of much reason, and more piety, in its communion. They know it to have been the religion of their forefathers, which had possession of men's understandings before Protestantism had a name.' He then enumerates the following arguments in favour of the Catholic Church:—'First, its doctrines having had a long continuance and possession of the Church, which therefore, cannot easily be supposed in the present possessors to be a design, since they have received them from so many ages. Its long prescription, which is such a prejudice as cannot with many arguments be retrenched; as relying upon these grounds,—that truth is more an-

cient than falsehood—that God would not, for so many ages, forsake his Church, and leave her in error. Then comes the splendour and beauty of that Church, its pompous service, the stateliness and solemnity of its hierarchy, its name, ‘Catholic,’ the antiquity of its doctrines, the continual succession of its bishops, and their immediate derivation from the apostles, its title to succeed St. Peter. Add to this, the multitude and variety of people which are of its persuasion; the consent of elder ages; the great consent of one part with another, contrasted with the great differences which are commenced among their adversaries. To this again add, its happiness in being the instrument in converting divers nations; the advantage of monarchical (the papal) government, the benefit of which its members daily enjoy; the piety and austerity of its religious orders, the single life of its priests and bishops, the severity of its fasts, the great reputation of its bishops for faith and sanctity, known holiness of some of its religious founders of orders, its miracles, the accidents and casualties, which have happened to its adversaries, the oblique acts and indirect proceedings of some of those who have departed from it, and above all, the name of ‘heretic’ and ‘schismatic’ which the Catholic Church has fastened on them. Protestants commit themselves by the conduct of the new Reformers; at first few, and of the lowest rank of the clergy, being under ecclesiastical censures, assisted against their spiritual superiors by some secular powers, when both they and these were subject to that ecclesiastical hierarchy which they opposed.

From Sir Edwyn Sandy’s Relation of the Western Religions.—‘Of all probable proofs, the Catholic Church testimony is the most probable. What madness, then, it is for any man to tire out his soul, and to waste away his spirits in tracing out all the thorny paths of the controversies of these days, wherein to err is no less easy than dangerous! Why not rather betake himself to the right path of truth, whereunto God and nature, reason and experience, do all give witness? That is, why not associate himself to that Church whereinto the custody of this heavenly and supernatural truth hath been from heaven itself committed? Why not weigh discreetly which is the true church; and having once found it, why not receive faithfully and obediently what it delivers?’ These words, it is true, are put into the mouth of the Catholic by Sir Edwyn, but he, does not even attempt to answer them. Sir Edwyn thus proceeds:—

‘The Catholic Church was founded by the apostles, with promise that the gates of hell should not prevail against it. It has continued on now, till the end of 1600 years, with honourable and certain line, of near two hundred and forty Popes, successors of St. Peter,—both tyrants, traitors, pagans, and heretics, is vain wresting, raging, and undermining it. All the general councils that ever were in the world have approved and honoured it. God hath miraculously blessed it from above, so many learned doctors have enriched it with their writings, armies of saints have embellished it with their holiness, martyrs with their blood, virgins with their purity. Even at this day, amid the difficulties of unjust rebellions, and the unnatural revolts of her nearest children, she yet stretcheth out her arms to the utmost corners of the world, newly embracing whole nations into her bosom. In all opposite churches, there are found inward dissensions and contrariety, change of opinions, uncertainty of revolutions, with robbing of churches, rebelling against governors, and confusion of order. In the Catholic Church there is undivided unity, resolutions unalterable, the most heavenly order, reaching from the height of all power to the lowest of all subjection; all with admirable harmony, and undefective correspondence, bending the same way to the effecting of the same purpose,’ &c.

INTELLIGENCE.

(From the *London Catholic Magazine* for February, 1839.)

CONVERSIONS IN ENGLAND.—Jas. Wheble, Esq., of Woodley Lodge, late High Sheriff of Berkshire, in a letter to the editor of the *Reading Mercury*,

reckons the number of conversions to the Catholic faith in England to be about 2000 annually. Within the last few months, Dr. Walsh, Bishop of the Midland District, has confirmed 692 converts in the eastern counties.

CONVERSIONS IN HIGH LIFE.—We understand that a banker in the west end of London, long well known as a Perthshire baronet, has lately embraced the Catholic faith.

On the 29th December last, being the Feast of S. Thomas à Becket, Frederic Lucas, Esq., of the Middle Temple, Barrister at Law, abjured the tenets of the sect of Friends, or Quakers, and embraced the Catholic faith, receiving baptism at No. 14, York Place, Baker St., from the Rev. Father Lythgoe, S. J.

ITALY.—On the 20th August, a Jew, named Emmanuel Serusi, of Genoa, aged 17, was baptised in the church of St. Ambrose.

The Chevalier Rovida, professor of mathematics, has translated into Italian the life of Pius VII.

FRANCE.—The new bishop of Dijon, M. Rivet, has published a pastoral letter on the occasion of his consecration and installation.

A cross was planted on the 21st of October at Sauveres near Amiens. A large assemblage witnessed the ceremony.

A Jew, aged 25, was admitted into the Church at St. Pol, diocese of Arras, and was baptised.

The new chapel of the seminary of St. Sulpice at Paris, has been finished, and was blessed by the Archbishop on the 20th Nov.

The Protestants (says the *Ami de la Religion*) complain much of the Catholic clergy, who oppose, as far as they can, the circulation of their bibles. They say that they are opposed to the distribution of the word of God; but we should say rather to the circulation of the word of man, for their Protestant translations of the bible are more or less impressed with error. But the Catholics are not singular in their opposition, for the Rabbi of Aschaffembourg, in Germany, has prohibited the Jews of his district from receiving into their synagogues and schools, the bibles which are distributed by the Protestant Societies.

BELGIUM.—Two English ladies, a mother and daughter, converts from Protestantism, lately received conditional baptism at Furnes.

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE.—From our advertising columns it will be seen that a meeting of the Roman Catholics of this district, was held on Sunday, (22d July) after service, for the purpose of raising funds to build a suitable place of worship. We learn that upwards of £200 was subscribed on the spot towards that object.—*Graham's Town Journal*.

ALGIERS.—M. Garcin de Tassy, brother of the orientalist of that name, has, it is said, opened a subscription to found a Catholic library in Algiers, for the purpose, not only of lending religious and pious books, but of distributing them gratuitously.

CATHOLIC BARRISTERS.—Saturday, the 26th January, Thos. Chisholme Anstey and John Bernard Burke, Esqs., were called to the degree of Barrister at Law by the Honourable Society of the Middle Temple, having first taken and subscribed the oath appointed under the Catholic Relief Act of the 10 Geo. IV.

Any profit which may arise from this publication, will be devoted to the Catholic Free Schools, at Calcutta.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor, care of Messrs. W. Rushton and Co.

Printed by Messrs. W. Rushton and Co., for the Proprietors, price one rupee per month, or ten rupees per annum in advance.

FIRST NUMBER OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

ERRATA.		CORRIGE.
P.	2 line 9.....	depository.....depository.
"	3 near end.....	Asticus.....Atticus.
"	4 line 10.....	argument, is.....argument, which is
"	" ".....	unravalled.....unravalled.
"	6 " 28.....	Gospel.....Gospels.
"	from end line 18,.....	of reason.....of reason, we mean,
"	do. line 17,.....	we mean.....dele.
"	7 line 3.....	waving.....waiving.
"	line 7.....	obvious.....obvious.
"	middle.....	retrogræd.....retrograded.
"	8 line 11.....	without of.....without.
"	" " 13.....	reclaim.....resist.
"	" " 17.....	Beya.....Beza.
"	" " ".....	cannot more.....cannot more.
"	15 line 39.....	is vain.....in vain.
"	16 " 5.....	haas.....has.

indulge their taste in lighter and more pleasing subjects. But let them not be dismayed. What task is there drier or more repulsive than the perusal of law-deeds? Yet the eager interest, with which the eye pores over them, when there is question of establishing a claim to a disputed property, acts like a magician's spell; and converts a barren waste into a luxuriant vale. Each one's religion forms the title-deeds, on which rests his right to heaven. If it be of the last importance for him to secure such an estate, he ought to spare no pains in examining the validity of his title, and to take the utmost care that no flaw be found in it, when he shall come to lay it before his judge. However distasteful and irksome may be the toil, yet the hope of future bliss will throw over theological discussion a charm and grace, that will soften its asperity. We, on our part, will endeavour to present it to our readers in the gayest attire that may besem the staidness and gravity of its character. We can moreover assure them, that, like many an old gentleman whose brow has been frosted and wrinkled by Time, it will grow upon their esteem and affection, in proportion as they become more familiar with it, or learn to appreciate the deeply-interesting truths which it delivers.

If however they will not be persuaded to attack our 'serried files,' bristled, as they seem, with pointed argument, we exhort them at least to observe and ponder attentively the little motto written on the war-flag, which we have hung out of the head of our paper. Though short, it is richly fraught with meaning. Each word affords matter for the deepest thought, because each word speaks a volume: for it not only affirms that there is but one True Church of God on earth, but also assigns the reasons, why more than one should not, or cannot exist. It was given by St. Paul to this Church, who emblazoned it on her sacred banner; that banner, which

for 1800 years has braved the battle-shock of Error, and waved triumphant over all the powers of Hell. '*One body and one spirit—one hope of our calling—one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism.*'

As there is but one God, so is there but one Faith or Religion, which he has Revealed to men; for one Revealed Religion is sufficient to answer all the purposes for which Religion has been established. Its purport was to disclose to us the mysteries of God's nature and perfections; to teach us his great precepts and commands, together with the strong animating motives which we have to fulfil them; to point out to us the great end of our being, and to provide us with ample means by which it may be secured. What need is there of more than one Religion to attain these several objects? The highest mysteries, however dark in their nature, may in one Religion alone be so clearly revealed, either by God personally, or by Ambassadors whom he sends, as to be adapted equally to the capacity of the meanest peasant, as to that of the most learned philosopher. For, to learn them, nothing more in each age and condition is required, than to have ears to listen, understanding to perceive, and free-will to determine.

The precepts of the moral code surely demand but one revelation; for grounded on the natural law which is written on the heart of each one, they are precisely the same with respect to all mankind. Revealed Religion does nothing more than unfold and present them in a clearer light. To observe this law, however well it may be known, is difficult; but it is difficult to all; for all men are weak by nature, all prone to vice from their infancy, all attracted by the pleasure of sensible objects, all equally standing in need of supernatural assistance. Is not one revealed religion then able to present all the encouraging motives, that may animate us to undertake, and all the supernatural graces that are requisite to fulfil our duties? What affects one produces an impression on another. For our minds and bodies are cast in the same mould, and are sprung from one common source. Our hopes and fears, our desires, feelings, temptations and passions, our thirst of happiness and our dread of pain are, with slender shades of difference in intensity, the same in each one, whatever may be his nation, his pursuits or his habits. Are not the glories of an eternal kingdom which are promised to the virtuous, the misery of never-ending torments denounced against the wicked; the sufferings of a God, who became man, to deliver us from the one, and secure to us the other;—are not such motives as these of equal force in the four quarters of the globe, and as capable of awakening the energies of an African as of an American, of an Asiatic as of a European?

There is but one Faith, because *there is one hope of our calling*, one great end for which we have been all created. We are all placed here to fight for the same glorious kingdom of eternal happiness. Endowed with the same powers, and subject to the same defects, what need have we of different means to achieve it, when the same fierce enemies stand equally arrayed against us all;—the same enemies in the pleasures of the world, in the bad passions of our hearts, in the invisible powers of darkness who burn with an indiscriminate hatred against the whole human race? No! One Revealed Religion, which is the armoury founded by God for man's benefit, is sufficient to provide similar beings with similar weapons of defence.

Religion, in the Moral, may be compared to the sun in the Physical world. For as one sun is sufficient to illumine all the nations of the earth ; as it alone, by the genial warmth which it diffuses, imparts everywhere fertility to the watered soil, and makes it productive in every kind and variety of vegetation ; as it suffices to spread beauty and colour over every object in nature, and give infinite charms to what would be otherwise dreary, obscure and unsightly ; as these different effects are produced by one sun in every part of the earth ;—(to say nothing of other planets to which they may be communicated) ;—so similar results, of equal diversity and extent, may, throughout the moral world, proceed from one Divinely-revealed Religion, which shall both illumine the minds and warm the hearts of men ; which shall cause the soul, watered by the dews of heaven, to shoot forth an endless variety of noble and heroic deeds ; which, chasing before it the noxious vapours of ignorance and doubt, shall discover what was before unseen, illustrate what was obscure, beautify what seemed terrific, open the secret springs of God's ways to our view, and unfold the beauty, proportion and symmetry, which pervade the whole system of Divine Providence. The great author of nature in his wisdom knows how to produce an infinite variety of contrary effects by the operation of a single cause, and rejects every instrument which is unnecessary in the execution of his grand designs ; and as he would not give two suns to rule the universe, because one, under his directing hand, would produce the multiplied different effects of a thousand suns, so he would not reveal two religions ; because he is able to establish one single religion, which shall be as well adapted to the whole human race as if each individual had a religion of his own.

In proving that there is but one true Revealed Religion, because one is sufficient, we do not allude to religions which are contradictory to each other. For these, it is evident, God cannot reveal. He might indeed reveal *different* creeds, but not *contradictory* ones. He might, if it pleased his Wisdom, establish a different religion in every country of the earth ; but though they would be dissimilar, they could not be opposite. If two creeds contradict each other, if one affirms a doctrine which the other flatly denies, they cannot both emanate from God, who is the essential Truth : because one creed is necessarily false, whilst the other is as necessarily true.

As therefore the Catholic Church is, in many points, diametrically opposite to the Protestant Church, it is as evident as a mathematical demonstration, that both cannot be the True Church of Christ. For one single error in points of faith is enough to make either of them forfeit so exalted a title.

Without pretending at present to determine which of the several existing churches is actually the true one, we cannot suffer to pass without observation the clear, but daring train of reasoning, which in this matter the Catholic Church employs. Like a bold champion, confident in his prowess and the justice of his cause, she stakes her whole truth, her whole credit on any one single doctrine which she maintains. 'I assert,' she says, 'that Jesus Christ is really present under the mere appearances of bread and wine in the Blessed Eucharist. All the Reformed Churches contradict it. Either I therefore, or they are in the wrong : for though one must be right, we cannot both be so. If I am proved to err in this single point, I surrender all claim to be the true religion of Jesus Christ,

which cannot admit of the least mixture of error. But if with justice I can maintain this point,—if here I am right, then (nothing can be more evident) all the Reformed Churches are false.’ Such is the method of her reasoning against every sect who dissents from her. Her tone is clear, distinct, determined, strong. There is no shuffling in her manner, no mincing no wavering, no compounding. Her voice is that of a master-mind, which sees truth with the distinctness of intuition. Her reasoning indeed is a terrible two-edged sword, and every one but herself trembles to handle it. But She grasps it without fear, because it is her own, and she wields it with the strength and dexterity of a giant.

There can be but one Church of God, because all the faithful must form *one body*, animated with *one spirit*. Children of one Heavenly Father who is the God of peace, we ought to be united together by the holy bonds of Charity: because Charity leads to peace and happiness. Whatever draws this link closer together must be good, whatever dissolves it must be bad. But nothing tends more to destroy charity, and interrupt the harmony which it breathes—the happiness which it imparts, than difference of religion. Cast your eyes on the various jarring sects into which the reformation has broken Christianity, and ask whether this state of things could have sprung from the God of Peace. On the contrary, what picture can be imagined more beautiful, more lovely, more glorious, or more sublime than all the members, which constitute Man’s great family on earth, believing precisely the same divine truths, keeping the same divine precepts, offering the same sacrifice to their Maker, receiving the same sacraments, meeting together in the same churches,—the people united to the Priests, the Priests to their Bishops, the Bishops to the supreme visible Head who rules under God;—the whole being one compact body, breathing the same sentiments in different languages, observing the same laws with different national habits, and preserving one spirit and one soul amid the opposite interests of independent kingdoms. It is the picture of a church which the reformation has sought to destroy; but a picture designed by Him, who inspired the words of our motto; *one body and one spirit,—one Lord, one faith, one baptism*.

PROTESTANT CHARITY AND CATHOLIC BIGOTRY.

Among the various expedients used by artifice and misrepresentation to excite popular prejudice against Catholics, there is probably none more effective than the charge of uncharitableness in holding the doctrine of exclusive salvation. The ignorant, the credulous, and uninquiring, are taught to believe that Catholics are such spiritual misanthropists as not to wish for the salvation of any who differ from them in religious belief. And that their Church arrogates to herself the power of consigning all who separate from her communion to eternal perdition. The truth however, is, that the Catholic is bound to pray for the salvation of every fellow-creature without any exception, and the Church neither does nor could exclude from happiness or admit to salvation any but such as are excluded therefrom by the justice of God, or admitted thereto by his mercy. Much less does she wish the loss of any one. She prays for all that God would bring them to the knowledge of the truth and crown them with eternal bliss. It is her province, not to make articles of faith, but, to declare the condi-

tions upon which God has promised eternal life. Now what words could be more express on this point than those of Christ himself? '*He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.*' And again, '*Hear the Church — if he will not hear the Church let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican.*' And St. Paul, who became all to all in order to gain all to Christ, thought it no breach of charity to write in the following manner:—'*A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject; knowing that he that is such, is subverted and sinneth being condemned of himself.*' In another place the same great Apostle declares in the most positive terms, that '*without Faith it is impossible to please God.*' St. John even forbids the faithful to receive a heretic into their houses or to bid him God speed who bringeth not this doctrine of Christ. St. Peter informs us, that '*many pervert the scripture to their own destruction.*'

Many other passages to the same effect might be cited, but these will suffice to prove that before the Church had assembled her councils, the necessity of faith and condemnation of heresy had been enforced in the Scripture. To blame the Catholic, therefore, for believing what has been so clearly revealed, is to accuse, not his creed, but the Holy Scripture. How grossly then is not the Catholic Church misrepresented by the clamour against heresy, as if it were to her uncharitableness, and not to Scripture that the term owed its rise? Catholics only follow the doctrine of the Apostles, and all Christian antiquity in believing that heresy excludes from Salvation. Errors, however, do not constitute heresy, but only that perversity which induces men to remain obstinately attached to them: hence the expression of St. Augustin, '*I may err, but I will never be a heretic.*'

The first broachers of heresy are those against whom in every age the censures of ecclesiastical authority were chiefly directed; in conformity with the rule of St. Paul—'*reject an heretic after the first and second admonition, for such is condemned of himself.*' They were the first who made the choice, and divided from unity; their errors were their own and wilful; but when once their errors are established, supported by the laws of temporal princes, confirmed by time, and sanctioned by the multitude, however criminal they might have been in the first authors, and their adherents, yet with regard to succeeding generations they become hereditary, and, for the most part, involuntary. Catholics regard the former as rebels to the Divine authority of the Church, the latter, as being without any obstinacy against her decrees of which they, generally speaking, know nothing: these latter, although they belong not to the body, yet belong to the soul of the Church. Catholics maintain with St. Augustin, '*that a person imbued with the opinion of Photinus, and believing it to be the Catholic Faith, ought not to be called a heretic, unless after being instructed he choose rather to resist the Catholic Faith than to renounce the opinion he had embraced.*' In fine, they admit with the same Father—'*that we must not rank among heretics those who carefully seek after the truth, and are in a disposition to embrace it as soon as discovered.*' According to these principles the learned Bishop Challoner teaches—'*that if error comes from invincible ignorance, it exculpates from the sin of heresy, provided that with sincerity and without regard to worldly interest a person be ready to embrace the truth immediately it shall present itself to him.*' It is not then the invincible ignorance of the truth, but the wilful neglect of enquiring after it which renders a man criminal.

No one will, we imagine, deny that indifference as to what is the truth, or omission from whatever motive to enquire after it, or partiality in conducting the investigation, involves criminality, and can therefore be no excuse for a continuance in error; for to benefit by one's own wrong is no less repugnant to the divine than it is to human law. '*Inattention*,' says a learned Protestant,—*about the discovery of the truth is as real a moral depravity as is neglect of religious practice.*'—*Dr. Butler's Analogy.*

Having thus given a plain, and we trust, a clear statement of our doctrine concerning salvation out of the Church, we contend that there is nothing more uncharitable in it, than in the conduct of an individual who, on seeing his neighbour running heedlessly to the edge of a precipice, warns him of his danger: he made not the danger, so neither did the Church that of heresy: she merely proclaims it. Protestants, who accuse us of uncharitableness on this score, would appear to have forgotten, if indeed they ever knew, that precisely similar doctrine is set forth in their own professions of faith. For example in the 16th article of the original profession of the Kirk of Scotland we find the following declaration: 'As we believe in one God, as we most constantly believe, that there has been, now is, and to the end shall be *one kirk*, out of which kirk, neither life nor eternal felicity is to be hoped for, or had, and therefore we utterly abhor the blasphemy of those who affirm that men who live according to *equity* and *justice* shall be saved in whatever religion they may have lived.' Her subsequent confession of faith approved by the General Assembly and ratified by Parliament in 1649, speaks similar language. 'The visible Church which is also Catholic or Universal, consists of all those throughout the world that profess the True Religion. And is the Kingdom of the Lord, the House and Society of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.' Similar doctrine is, or at least was, held by the Protestants of France, Holland, and Geneva, and we need hardly add, the Church of England. 'I know,' says the grand patriarch of Protestantism, Martin Luther 'Some who were of opinion, fifteen years ago, that every man would be saved in his own way of thinking. Now, what is this, but to collect all the enemies of Christ into one phalanx? Nay, in such cases there must have been no need of Christ or his Gospel at all.' (Luther in 47 Genesis, Tom. 6, p. 633.) 'If the Church of Rome' (says Tillotson, a great authority, among Protestants) be the Catholic Church, it is necessary to be of that communion, because out of the Catholic Church there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.' (Edt. Post. Obit. Tom. 6, p. 245, &c.) 'In fine,' says the learned Dr. Pearson, Protestant Bishop of Chester, the necessity of believing the Catholic Church appears in this, that Christ has appointed it the only way to eternal life: Christ never appointed two ways to heaven, nor did, he build a Church to save some and make another institution for other men's salvation. There is no other name under heaven whereby we must be saved but the name of Jesus, and that name is not otherwise given than in the Church.'—'As none were saved from the deluge but such as were within the ark of Noah, so none will ever escape the eternal wrath of God which belong not to the Church of God (Pearson in the creed p. 349 Ed. A.D. 1669). It has been, we think, justly remarked, that to tax the Catholic Church with want of charity on this essential point after the above testimonies, must appear not only unreasonable, but, in the phraseology of Tillotson, 'dint of *impudence* and *facing down* of mankind.'

DR. ST. LEGER's friends will be happy to learn that there is a letter in town, in which it is mentioned, that the passengers of the *Seringapatam* arrived in England—all well.

We owe it ourselves no less than to many of our subscribers to apologize for the non-delivery of the first number of the *Bengal Catholic Expositor* until a late hour on Saturday, and we have reasons to believe, that some did not receive it till three or four days after its publication. Although we cannot aver that this was altogether unavoidable, yet we trust, our friends will make every allowance for this irregularity in the delivery, considering the confusion generally attendant on the first issue of a new periodical. Indeed, we had some apprehension of the evil complained of, and adopted precautionary measures to guard against it; but, it seems, our endeavours proved of little avail. We hope, however, that the arrangements we have now made, will prevent the recurrence of any irregularity in the future distribution of the *Expositor*. As to the sins of omission and commission of the printers, we refer our readers to the Errata inserted by them.

A SHORT WAY OF ENDING RELIGIOUS DISPUTES WITH OUR SEPARATED BRETHERN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—At one time polemical discussion was my delight, and on many a difference between Catholic and Protestant have I entered into verbal or epistolary discussion. The result was, the more I argued with my Protestant friends, and the more I read their books against the Catholic religion, the more I became convinced of the truth of my own. Times have however changed with me, and I have now neither leisure nor inclination to dispute in the way I was wont to do; whilst experience has pointed out a short method of ending all disputes about religion. Under the impression that among your readers there may be some similarly situated, I venture, through the medium of your pages, to submit for their consideration the plan I now generally adopt with my Protestant friends, who choose to attack the Catholic religion.

The first question I ask them is, whether they admit, that I or any body else, holding firmly the doctrines of the Catholic Church, and leading a life conformable to the moral precepts of Christianity, can be saved? The answer to this question is generally in the affirmative; when I tell them that if according to their own admission, salvation is attainable in the Catholic Church,* and as I want nothing more than salvation, I see no further use of arguing with them on any point of difference.

But there are some among them who in answer to my question say, that if I hold such and such doctrines of the Catholic Church, I *cannot* be saved. To these I ask a second question, viz. 'by what rule am I to judge whether the doctrine in question be orthodox or the contrary?' To this the only reply is, try the doctrine with the Bible, and with the aid of

* On this subject see 'Protestant Recommendations in favour of the Catholic Church,' No. 1, pages 14 and 15. *Bengal Catholic Expositor*.

reason, which God has given you for this purpose, judge of its congruity or otherwise with the precepts there laid down. I answer,—‘ I have my friend, done so ; and to the best of my knowledge, find the doctrine in question perfectly consonant to the spirit of holy writ ; I therefore, according to your own counsel, must hold the said doctrine,’

By these two simple questions and answers, comprehensible to the most ordinary capacity, I have invariably succeeded in bringing to a speedy conclusion all religious disputes with Protestants, which by following any other method, would have required more time and talents than are at the command of your well-wisher,

8th July, 1839.

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Selections.

THE ALLIANCE BETWEEN POPERY AND HEATHENISM.

Letter, II.—Dr. Wiseman to Mr. Poynder.

SIR,—I contented myself, in my first letter, with simply noting the first impression produced on my mind by the perusal of your work ; I will, in this, examine the worth of the argument which it contains ; after which I will descend, in my future communications, to the more detailed examination of its principal count against us.

Your book professes to demonstrate the alliance between the Catholic religion, or, as you term it, Popery, and heathenism, by pointing out an identity between many ceremonies, and, as you say, doctrines, in the ancient and modern religions of Rome. Your mildest conclusion of course is, that Popery is nothing but a human religion, having no claims to a divine original.

I will for a moment grant you the full extent of your assumptions and premises ; I will concede that all the facts you have brought forward are true, and all the parallels you have established between our rites and those of paganism correct ; and I will join issue with you on your conclusions, trying them by clearly applicable tests.

You are doubtless aware that Dr. Spencer, a learned divine of the established church, published two folio volumes, replete with extraordinary erudition, entitled *De Legibus Hebræorum Ritibus, et earum ratione* ; which has gone through many editions, both here and on the continent. Now the entire drift and purport of this work is manifestly two-fold. First, to prove that the great design of God, in giving rites and ceremonies to the Jews, was to prevent their falling into idolatry. Secondly, to demonstrate that almost every practice, rite, ceremony and act, so given, was directly borrowed from the Egyptian heathens. If you wish to satisfy yourself of this latter point, you have only to read over the table of contents to the several books, and you will find, that whether we speak of the more solemn and special injunctions, or of the minutest details of the ceremonial law ; of circumcision, and of sacrifice in all its varieties, and with all its distinctive ceremonies ; of purification and lustration, and new moons ; of the ark of the covenant and the cherubim ; of the temple and its oracle ; of the Urim and Thummim, and the emissary goat ; of them all Spencer has endeavoured to prove, and that to the satisfaction of many learned men, that they pre-existed among the Egyptians and other neighbouring nations. But I do not mean to force you into any such specific consequence ; I wish to leave you a choice of conclusions.

In the first place, do you dissent from this learned divine, and assert that he has not made good his point of establishing the derivation of all or most Jewish rites from those of the heathens ? Then, Sir, I conclude that there may

be such resemblances between the ceremonies and institutions of two religions, one false and the other true, as to enable a man to write two folios upon them, and yet these resemblances may be purely accidental, and no ways show any real connexion between them. Your one hundred and twenty octavo pages have not done as much for us as Spencer's two folios have for the Jews, and therefore we may conclude the same of your lucubrations, and of your master's before you.

Secondly, do you, with a great body of learned men, admit that Spencer has made good his point? Then I conclude, that a religion may have borrowed all its ceremonies and rites from its heathen neighbours, and yet not be, on that account, the less divine and sanctioned by God. Nay, to take the whole of Spencer's reasoning, the institution of such rites, instead of leading to idolatry, is the best preservative against it.

Now, of these two conclusions, and their application to the value of your work, I leave you the free choice. Either, after all your efforts, you have established no connexion between our ceremonies and those of the heathens; or if you have, you have done nothing towards impugning the worth and correctness of the Catholic religion.

But let me ask, does it follow that every resemblance is proof that one has borrowed from the other? May not both have come from a common source? May they not, in both, be the spontaneous and natural manifestation of feelings common to men under similar circumstances? The Indian kneels in prayer, or raises up his eyes to heaven; does it follow that all else who do so have learnt it from the Indian; Do not nations the most distant express their feelings of respect and affection in the same way? do they not bow, or prostrate, or embrace, or shake hands? and yet no one sees therein any necessary dependance or close alliance between them, but we consider all these outward demonstrations as common and neutral property, which all may enjoy. Now, Sir, here is the great fallacy of your own and your predecessor's reasoning. What you have said of miracles, after Bishop Hall, that they must be judged by the doctrine they confirm, not the doctrines by the miracles,* is much truer of ceremonies; they must be judged by the doctrines they outwardly manifest, not the doctrines by the external rite.

If it be lawful at all to show respect to images or relics, and if, in the mind, the line is clearly drawn between that respect and the adoration reserved to God alone, it matters not by what conventional act it is exhibited. To genuflect, or to prostrate, or to bow, or to kiss, are but indifferent acts, receiving their value from the mutual understanding of men. In England, the Catholic kneels before a bishop to receive his blessing; in Italy, he is content with kissing his hand. In the west, we manifest our respect by uncovering the head, and consequently we serve bare-headed at the altar; in China it would be deemed disrespectful to appear so before the great, and consequently the Catholic priest officiates there with his head covered. The different ways, therefore, wherein such feelings are exhibited, are equally harmless; it is the inward application only that can give them a moral determination.

See then how you proceed. You *assume* that our doctrine is incorrect regarding saints and their representations, and then, of course, any outward mark of respect is wrong; and as the marks of respect, if shown, *must*, by human nature, be the same as others have shown in a false worship, you identify the acts, and lay them to the charge of the religion. Again, if our faith in the Eucharist is well-grounded, we certainly are fully warranted in bowing down before it, and adoring it. You *take it for granted* that it is false, and then, with a blasphemous levity, which must chill the blood of every Catholic, speak of the worship, which must be justified or condemned according to the

* Page 102. Admitting this position to be correct, how comes Paley's, who follows exactly the opposite course, to be the established work on the evidences, in Protestant education? Does he not place the pyramid on its point, proving Christianity from miracles, instead of basing miracles on the truth of Christianity?

dogma it obeys, as idolatrous and profane. (pp. 66, 88) Now, Sir, suppose a Socinian or infidel acted thus, and assuming at once that there is no redemption through the cross, and no corruption of original sin, were to censure your practice of baptism as a fond superstition, scoff in derision at the sign of the cross their used, or at the idea that outward ablution could affect the soul, and ridicule your solemn rite in terms of indecent profaneness, and compare it to the washing of the heathens for the forgiveness of sin, as described in your apposite lines from Ovid : (p. 20.)

‘ Ah nimium faciles, qui tristia crimina cædis
Fluminea tolli posse putetis aqua ;’

would you not reply, that the whole question turned upon the doctrine involved in these practices, and that to dispute about the outward forms was but discussing the shadow, while the body was neglected ; that it did not follow from a similarity of rite, even coupled to some resemblance of doctrine, that the two were identical or equally reprehensible. Your reply would be quite correct, and I beg of you to apply it. So long as you proceed on the supposition that we are wrong in the doctrine, you will have it all your own way. But it is there where the entire question rests, and where we are at issue with you. It is the dogmas of a religion which must decide its value ; their outward action depends on their inward worth. Some naturalists, like Virey or Lamarck, have compared the limbs and organization of men to those of the chimpanzee, and finding that they have ‘ organs, dimensions, and senses,’ very much alike, have concluded that the human race is descended from that respectable animal ; but they have judged as you have ; they have looked at outward appearance ; they have forgot the soul, the living spark of life and intelligence, the power of directing thought and action to high and immortal destinies. To compare two religions, and judge them identical, while the one professes to believe in only one God, in undivided Trinity, in the incarnation of his son, and redemption through his blood, with a professed system of polytheism, because the two have the same forms for expressing religious feelings, is assuredly as vain and absurd as the conduct of those philosophers. There are processions, and lights, and incense, in the Catholic and in the ancient Roman *worship*, therefore the two religions are identical. Truly ‘ there is a river in Macedon ; and there is also moreover a river at Monmouth ;’ therefore Macedon and Monmouth are both alike !

You have yourself, as I intimated in my first letter, greatly spoiled your cause, by introducing into it a comparison between our rites and those of India. For how, in the name of all history, did the Catholics of Italy, or Rome, or Ireland, come by Indian ceremonies ? When or how were they ever introduced into the service of the church ? These ceremonies, too, according to your quotations, appear to be of very great antiquity ; the holiness imparted by the Ganges, which you compare to the water-idolatry, as you call it, of the Irish, (p. 69) is a fundamental point of the Hindoo religion, and doubtless existed long before the time of Christ ; yet had it no parallel in western heathenism. How then did it get to Ireland, or any other Christian country ? Is it not manifest that the connexion between rites and practices so far apart, is more hidden and mysterious than you would have your readers imagine ? that instead of such resemblances giving any necessary proof of derivation, they only shew one of these two things : either that in every worship, however corrupt, there are fragments remaining of purer and primeval forms, which are found more or less disfigured in them all ; or else that nature directs men, under the most various circumstances, to a similar symbolization of their inward belief, and to similar acts of religious worship. And the more you can point out resemblances between the acts of religious observance prevalent in unconnected countries, the more you establish these positions. And if you would look into Catholic works, you would find, that so far from wishing to pass over or conceal such coincidences, they are even more explicit on them than

you have been ; and that, instead of fearing them as evidence against themselves, they insist upon them as arguments in favour of their belief. I do not mean merely scientific authors, as Mabillon, Durantus, or Bona, but books written for general edification. Read for instance, and I am sure it would instruct you on many points, the learned and pious Abbé Gerbet's treatise ' Sur le dogme régénérative de la piété chrétienne,' and you will find how powerfully he uses the many cravings after the Catholic eucharist discernible in the rites of almost every heathen worship.

But I must not pass over the way in which your line of argument was met in older and better times. For perhaps you are not aware that our objections are much older than Dr. Meddleton, or Haspinian, or Brower de Niedek, both of whom you overlook in your valuable catalogue of writers on comparative idolatry. The first person who argued as you have done, was Julian the Apostate, who said that the Christians had borrowed their religion from the heathens.* This proves at once that even then the resemblance existed of which you complain as idolatrous ; so that it is not the offspring of modern corruption, but an inheritance of the ancient church. It proves that the alliance between *Christianity*, and heathenism existed 300 years after Christ, and that consequently so far popery and ancient Christianity are identical. The Manichees also are accused by St. Augustine, writing against Faustus, of having made the same charge.

Now to this objection the fathers answered precisely as I have done : ' Habemus quædam cum Gentibus communia, sed finem deversum,' says St. Augustine. And again, writing to Deogratias, ' Wherefore they who know the Christian books of both Testaments, do not blame the sacrilegious rites of the pagans because they built temples, instituted priesthoods, and offered sacrifices, but because these things were in honor of idols and demons From which you may sufficiently understand, that true religion reprehends, in the superstitions of the heathens, not so much that the immolated, for the saints of old immolated to the true God, as that they immolated to false gods.' It matters not how our rites and ceremonies resemble one another, so long as the worship to which we apply them is different.

(To be continued.)

DECLARATION OF THE CATHOLIC BISHOPS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

SECTION III.

On the Holy Scriptures.

In England the Catholic Church is held out as an enemy to the reading and circulating of the holy scriptures.

Whereas the Catholic Church venerates the holy scriptures as the written part of the word of God ; she has in all ages been the faithful guardian of this sacred deposit ; she has ever laboured to preserve the integrity of these inspired writings, and the true sense in which they have been universally understood at all times from the apostolic age.

The Catholic Church has never forbidden or discouraged the reading or the circulation of authentic copies of the sacred scriptures in the original languages. She binds her clergy to the daily recital of a canonical office, which comprises a large portion of the sacred volume, and to read and expound to the faithful, in the vernacular tongue, on Sundays, the epistle or gospel of the day, or some other portion of the divine law.

As to translations of the holy scriptures into modern languages, the Catholic Church requires that none should be put into the hands of the faithful but such as are acknowledged by ecclesiastical authority to be accurate, and conformable to the sense of the originals. There never was a general law of the Catholic Church prohibiting the reading of authorized translations of the scriptures,

* Cyrilli Archiep. Alex. cont. Jul. Juliani Opera, editio Spanheim, tom II. p. 238.

but, considering that many, by their ignorance and evil dispositions, have perverted the meaning of the sacred text to their own destruction, the Catholic Church has thought it prudent to make a regulation, that the faithful should be guided in this matter by the advice of their respective pastors.

Whether the holy scriptures, which ought never to be taken in hand but with respect, should be made a class-book for children, is a matter of religious and prudential consideration, on which the pastors of the Catholic Church have a right to decide with regard to their own flocks; and we hold that in this matter none have a right to dictate to them.

The Catholics in England, of mature years, have permission to read authentic and approved translations of the holy scriptures, with explanatory notes; and are exhorted to read them in the spirit of piety, humility, and obedience.

Pope Pius VII. in a Rescript dated April 18, 1820, and addressed to the vicars apostolic in England, earnestly exhorts them to confirm the people committed to their spiritual care, in faith and good works; and for that end, to encourage them to read books of pious instruction, and particularly the holy scriptures, in translations approved by ecclesiastical authority; because, to those who are well disposed, nothing can be more useful, more consoling, or more animating, than the reading of the sacred scriptures, understood in their true sense—they serve to confirm the faith, to support the hope, and to inflame the charity of the true Christian.

But when the reading and circulation of the scriptures are urged and recommended as the entire rule of faith, as the sole means by which men are to be brought to the certain and specific knowledge of the doctrines, precepts, and institutions of Christ; and when the scriptures so read and circulated are left to the interpretation and private judgment of each individual: then such reading, circulation, and interpretation, are forbidden by the Catholic Church, because the Catholic Church knows, that the circulation of the scriptures, and the interpretation of them by each one's private judgment, was not the means ordained by Christ for the communication of the true knowledge of his law to all nations—she knows that Christianity was established in many countries before one book of the New Testament was written—that it was not by means of the scriptures, that the apostles and their successors converted nations, or any one nation to the unity of the Christian faith—that the unauthorized reading and circulation of the scriptures, and the interpretation of them, by private judgment, are calculated to lead men to contradictory doctrines on the primary articles of Christian belief; to inconsistent forms of worship, which cannot all be constituent parts of the uniform and sublime system of Christianity; to errors and fanaticism in religion, and to seditions, and the greatest disorders in states and kingdoms.

(To be continued.)

THE VOICE OF PRAYER.

I.

THE voice of prayer, how soft it rises,
Breathed in childhood's hour of bliss;
The music Heaven most dearly prizes
Is not more pure, more sweet than this!
In the rosy morn ascending,
Like love's incense on the air,
And with hymns of angels blending,
Oh! how sweet that voice of prayer

II.

The voice of prayer, how sweet when stealing
 From the fond and guileless breast,
 Every holy wish revealing
 Of a heart by virtue blest.
 Like the breath of perfume sighing
 From a bed of those fair flowers,
 That in beauty, never-dying,
 Bloom alone in Heaven's bright bowers.

III.

The voice of prayer, how prized by Heaven,
 Breathed by one with crime oppressed,
 Sighing now to be forgiven,
 Seeking mercy, grace, and rest :
 Like a lute, that, long forsaken,
 Hath in silence coldly lain,
 Touched once more, doth softly waken
 Music's sweetest notes again !

HOWARD.

REASONING IN A CIRCLE.

Protestants object that Catholics argue in what is called a vicious circle ; proving the Church by the Scripture, and the Scripture by the Church.

Answer. The mode of false reasoning, called a vicious circle, is to attempt to prove two things reciprocally by each other ; neither of which can be proved, otherwise. For if either can be so proved, there is no vicious circle, in arguing thence in proof of the other. And if (as may sometimes be the case) both the points can be proved separately, either may then be used as additional support to the other. Again : if either point is admitted by one party, it will furnish a good argument to prove the other point to him. Thus St. John the Baptist declared, that Christ was the Lamb of God, and that he had seen the Holy Spirit descend upon him ; and this to those who (not knowing Christ) knew John to be a prophet, was a good proof of what he testified in regard of Christ. On the other hand, Christ declared that John was a prophet, and more than a prophet ; which, to those who (not knowing John) knew Christ to be the Messiah, was a decisive testimony in favour of John.

If, again, one of the points is admitted on both sides, surely, arguing from this as a settled principle, is most legitimate reasoning and no circle. So, accordingly, Catholics, most properly and conclusively, prove the Church to Protestants by the Scripture, expressly held both by Protestants and Catholics, to be the word of God. Thus far, then, all is right ; and no Protestant can object to a Catholic proving the Church to him by the Scripture.

Now, as to proving the Scripture. The Protestant who makes the above objection necessarily gets into a dilemma from which there is no escaping. It is as follows :—Either there are sufficient proofs of the authenticity and divine authority of the Scripture—*independent of proving either by the testimony of the Church—or there are not.* If there are, those proofs, be they what they may, are of course accessible to the Catholic as to the Protestant, and equally competent to the one as to the other ; and both parties having proof of the Scripture, independent of the Church, are, in this respect, on an equal footing. If, on the contrary, there are not *such* sufficient proofs, the Protestant must either, as well as the Catholic, resort to the testimony of the Church, he must give up the Scripture as not proved at all, and Christianity along with it, Scripture being to him the only rule of Christian faith.

RELIGION IN AMERICA.

My poor father used to say, 'Sam, mind what I tell you; if a man don't agree in all particulars with his Church, and can't go to the whole hog with 'em, he aint justified on that account, no how, to separate from them; for Sam, '*Schism is a sin in the eye of God.*' The whole Christian world,' he would say, 'is divided into two great families, the Catholic and Protestant. Well, the Catholic is a united family, a happy family, and a strong family, all governed by one head; and, Sam, as sure as eggs is eggs, that family will grub out tother one, root and branch and stock, it won't so much as leave the seed of it in the ground to grow by chance as a natural curiosity. Now the Protestant family is like a bundle of refuse shingles, when a withered (bound) up together (which it never was and never will be to all eternity) no great of a bundle arter all, for you might take it up under one arm, and walk off with it without winking. But when lying all loose, as it always is, jist look at it, and see what a sight it is!—all blowing about by every wind of doctrine, some away up een a most out of sight, others rolling over and over in the dirt, some split to pieces, and others, so warped by the weather, and cracked by the sun—no two of 'em will lie so as to make a close jint. They are all divided into sects, railin, quarre llin, separatin, and agreein in nothin but hatin each other. It is awful to think on. Tother family will, some days or other, gather them all up, put them into a bundle, and bind 'em up tight, and condemn 'em as fit for nothing under the sun but the fire.'

INTELLIGENCE.

(*From the Catholic Magazine, for November, 1833.*)

ENGLAND.—MR. BLUNDELL'S WILL.—We are happy to announce that the question raised as to the validity of the bequests to the Vicars Apostolic of the London and Midland Districts has been settled to the mutual satisfaction of all parties concerned; so that the gentlemen of the long robe will be disappointed in their expectations of a rich harvest of fees. The sum to be received by the bishops is about £70,000. Under the same arrangement the other clerical legacies have been recognised.

LONDON.—We understand that the Earl of Shrewsbury, with his usual liberality, has given the splendid donation of a thousand pounds towards the erection of a new Catholic church in St. George's Fields.

AN ANECDOTE

(*From the weekly Orthodox Journal.*)

Worthy the consideration of persons who may have an erroneous idea of Catholic tenets, taken from the Real Doctrine of the Catholic Church on the Scripture, by the Rev. N. Rigby.

'I cannot help relating here a circumstance (I hope it is not foreign to the purpose) that happened to one of my acquaintance. He was travelling in a coach in which were three other respectable passengers. Among other subjects, the conversation (as is often the case) turned on the Catholics. One of the gentlemen immediately commenced a philippic against the Catholics, and called them idolaters, superstitious, murderers, and many other pretty names.

My acquaintance allowed the gentleman to pour out his abuse for some time without interruption, and appeared much amused by his bold assertions and flaming descriptions of the poor deluded Papists. During the conversation a person in liquor rode up to the coach window, and began to annoy the passengers by his yells and impertinent behaviour. My acquaintance immediately said to the gentleman, who was telling such pretty things about the Catholics, let us have this drunken man taken up, he has murdered two or three people. The gentleman replied 'Are you, Sir, certain that he has murdered two or three people? Can you prove it? Because it would be very unjust to take the man up, unless you could prove the crimes which you mention.' 'No,' answered my acquaintance, 'I am not certain.' And let me ask you, if you are certain that all the charges which you have just brought against the Catholics are true? I am a Catholic, and must tell you they are false, and if you would only follow the advice which you gave me about this man, you would find the truth of what I say. If you would not wish me to accuse this man of a crime of which I am not certain he has committed, I beg that you, for the future, will never accuse the Catholics of charges which you cannot prove to be true, nay, which, if you would only take the trouble to examine, you would find to be absolutely false.' The gentleman looked much perplexed, and was so ashamed of himself, that he never spoke another word until they parted. The other two gentlemen enjoyed the ^{adit}oke wonderfully, and laughed most heartily.

This mortal life is but a pilgrimage, full of labors, hardships, and perils, through an inhospitable desert, amidst numberless by-paths, and abounding with howling wild beasts. And the greatest danger frequently is the multitude of those who go astray before us.

CONSOLATORY ADVICE TO PERSONS IN AFFLICTION.

(From the *Weekly Orthodox Journal*.)

Fear not, child of affliction, but cast your care upon a redeeming God (*Psal.* lv. 22), who was himself a man of sorrow, and most intimate with grief. His sympathizing tears bore witness to our weakness (*John* ix. 35), and having undergone temptation (*Heb.* ii. 18), he will not permit you to be tempted beyond your ability to suffer (*Cor.* x. 13). You have been told that your very hairs are numbered (*Matt.* x. 30); that a sparrow cannot fall without his divine permission; and that you are more precious in his sight than many sparrows (*Luke*, xii. 17). If you are acceptable to God, it is necessary that temptation should prove you (*Tobias*, xii. 13), for he chastises those he loves (*Heb.* xii. 6); he tries them in the furnace of affliction, and it is through many tribulations we must enter the kingdom of heaven (*Acts*, xiv. 22). Perhaps you are not yet sufficiently refined (*Isaiah*, xlviii. 10); drink of the chalice, then, with confiding love, if it be not his will that you decline the draught (*Mark*, xiv. 36). David and John were both especial favourites, and yet each had his heavy trials upon earth. You are told he who freely parts with his life shall save it (*Matt.* xvi. 25); it is therefore wise to take up cheerfully a cross we cannot fly from. God can make all things co-operate for good (*Rom.* viii. 28), as he did with Joseph, whom he raised from a dungeon and reproach, to feed his family in a time of famine; to save much people alive (*Gen.* i. 21), and to teach the very senators of the nation wisdom (*Psal.* cv. 22). Although like Job you were seated on a dunghill, he can place you on a level with the princes of your people (*Psal.* cxiii. 8). He delivered Peter from the prison (*Acts.* v.), Jeremiah from the pit, Daniel among the lions (*Dan.* vi. 27), and the three faithful Hebrew children from the fire (*Dan.* iii.)

If you are poor, God can bless your future industry on earth, or summon you to heaven, with those poor in spirit, to whom he has declared his kingdom shall belong (*Luke*, vi. 20.) When he was on earth he was poor himself, almost beyond example, for he had not even where to lay his head (*Luke*, ix. 58).

If you are in debt he can assist to discharge it, as he did the poor man's widow (2 *King* iv. 6); or relieve you by awakening the compassion of your creditor, and bring you again together upon friendly terms (*Prov.* xxii. 2), until you can discharge your debt with gratitude.

If you want apparel, 'tis he who clothes the lily of the field (*Luke*, xxii. 27); who saved the apparel of his people from decay during the forty years they journeyed through the desert (*Deut.* xxix. 5), and who knows that you need those things, even before you ask them (*Matt.* vi. 8).

If you are slandered, remember how the early Christians were accused of devouring children at communion. That Christ, and his first martyr Stephen, were accused of blasphemy (*John*, x. and *Acts*, vi). Remember that none can stand perfectly justified before God (*Psal.* cxliii. 2), in whose presence even the angels are not pure. If you are accused with justice, let the rod and reproof correct you (*Prov.* xxix. 15); if unjustly, God can bring forth your justice to the light (*Psal.* xxxvii.), like Joseph, and Susanna (*Gen.* xli. and *Dan.* xiii).

If you are in pain, remember the death and passion of your Saviour, and covet the reward for being faithful unto death (*Rev.* ii. 10).

If your sins oppress you, remember that those who are heavy laden are invited to their God, who has promised to refresh them (*Matt.* xi. 28); that those who come to him he will not cast away (*John.* vi. 37); that he is nigh to them who are of a contrite heart (*Psal.* xxxiv. 18), and that he will surely save all those who have an humble spirit.

If your benevolent endeavours are despised and resisted, so were those of Moses when he strove to pacify his contending brethren; yet, after forty years of servitude in exile, he was selected as the leader of a resistless host (*Exodus*, ii. and iii).

MODESTY.

Modesty is the chastity of female innocence—the ornament of virtue—the angelic grace of loveliness—the sanctity of manners—the amiable criterion of innate purity of heart—the index of refined sensibility of soul—and the Psyche of the graces. Where this divine heaven-born quality is wanting, beauty is a scentless rose—loveliness uncharming—innocence unadorned—manners insipid—purity of heart doubtful—and sensibility unamiable. It may be truly said, that Modesty is the sum of all the virtues.

Any profit which may arise from this publication, will be devoted to the Catholic Free Schools, at Calcutta.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor, care of Messrs. W. Rushton and Co.

Printed by Messrs. W. Rushton and Co., for the Proprietors. Price one rupee per month, or ten rupees per annum in advance.

THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

'One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.'

No. III.

JULY 20, 1839.

VOL. I.

We are grateful to the Editor of the *Christian Advocate* for his kindness in copying a part of the Catholic articles of belief, drawn up by our English Bishops. If he had transcribed the whole of them, and presented a copy to each of the gentlemen who write in his columns, we should have felt ourselves bound by still stronger obligations. Yet we doubt, whether this scheme, if he had adopted it, would have altogether protected our doctrines from misrepresentation;—not that they are involved in the least obscurity—not that they have been unknown to the whole world for centuries; but because we are sensible that, on Catholic subjects, the memory of Protestant authors is so very weak, that with a copy even of our articles before them, they are very apt to slide unconsciously from what we profess into what we abhor. Hence it is that, though Councils have in the most precise words defined the articles of our faith, though Catholic authors have set them forth in the clearest order, and explained them in every variety of style which language affords, yet we still observe tenets, a thousand times denied, laid to our charge with as much coolness as if they had always been admitted. If this is a misfortune which the true Church of Christ must expect to endure as long as there are sects dissenting from her,—we may then indeed express our gratitude to the *Christian Advocate* for his benevolent design, but not cherish a hope of its being crowned with success.

He has chosen a certain number of tenets, and called upon us to state the scriptural passages which may be adduced in support of them. Convinced that the pure motive of coming to a knowledge of truth alone prompted the request, we should deem it our duty immediately to comply with it, if it did not interfere with the order of the subjects which we have proposed to discuss. As, however, the information which he seeks may be had in almost any of our Catholic books of controversy, he would do well to peruse them, until we be able, as we hope ere long, to devote our pages to his favorite questions. But we do not pledge ourselves to set apart altogether the authority of the Fathers. Aware indeed of the strength and superiority, which the consentient voice of all that is holy and learned in antiquity gives us over the weak judgment of a private in-

dividual, we foresee so distinctly how unequal must be the nature of any contest between him and ourselves, that we would gladly, in favour of an enemy who so modestly asks it, show our gallantry in divesting ourselves of more than half our force. But it may not be. This is not a strife of honour,—it is not a tilting-match where witty opponents may exercise and display their skill ;—Here the highest interests of truth, our best and dearest hopes are at stake. Besides, as with the more learned Protestants, we receive the Canon and inspiration of the Testament on the voice of the Church which existed before it, we lay claim to a more consistent method of reasoning, than to reject this same authority when, with equal clearness, it points out and defines the only thing of value in the Testament—*its true meaning*. However, though on this point we are superior to the *Christian Advocate*, yet in another we freely acknowledge, that he has the vantage-ground over us. Our tenets are broad and open as the day : his are kept back from view. Ours are fixed, uniform and unchangeable : his, like the hues of an expiring dolphin, are beautiful in their diversity, but variable and evanescent. Ours he can steadily regard : but his the eye cannot rest on, because they vary like a fluxion. In return for our politeness in engaging to bring forward the proofs, in support of the propositions which have been distinguished by his particular regard, we hope that he will furnish us with a list of the tenets of the *Christian Advocate*, ‘conducted by gentlemen of different religious denominations.’ Does he believe with Luther in consubstantiation or with Zuinglius in a figurative presence ? Does he with the rough German Reformer cut his way to heaven without good works, or does he with the Light of Geneva maintain, that God is the author of Sin, and that we are fore-doomed either to be saved or to be damned ? There are many other points which we should like to ascertain, if he find it practicable to fix on paper his fluctuating notions of *Religion*.

INVOCATION OF SAINTS AND ANGELS.

No one, of a dispassionate, candid and liberal turn of mind, can peruse the declamatory tirades which appear—not like angel’s visits few and far between—against Popery, as the ancient religion is politely designated, without being forcibly struck with the tone of moral and intellectual superiority, which our opponents so modestly assume in their own behalf. They appear to be fully persuaded that they are themselves in the enjoyment of every kind of knowledge, while we are sunk in the most abject state of ignorance ; that they walk in the effulgence of light, while we set in cimmerian darkness. Under the influence, apparently, of such notions, they are more disposed to dictate to us what we believe, or ought to believe, than to reason with us on points on which we differ. The sum of their argument generally consists in an exulting reference to scripture, as if it were either unknown to us, or conclusive in their favour. They act towards us indeed, as if they knew the secrets of our hearts, and consequently what we believe and what we do not believe, infinitely better than we do ourselves. Whether this extraordinary faculty be ascribable to the novel and curious light which each of them draws, after his own peculiar fashion and taste, from the Bible, or to their habitual practice of drawing upon their own imaginations for what they are pleased, in the fullness of their charity, to call our creed, is

a point which we shall not take upon us to determine. This much however is certain, they impute doctrine to us which we hold in abhorrence, and then have the amiable simplicity of gravely refuting them as if they actually formed a part of our creed. This is like putting a hideous mask upon a man that the mob may pelt him for an ugly fellow.

For example, our adversaries assert that we ascribe the attributes of God to creatures, that we give them God's honor, that we put them in the place of Christ and depend more upon their intercession than upon His Mediation : in fine, that we put creatures upon an equality with the Creator. They then proceed to prove, what no one ever denied, that such doctrine is idolatrous, derogatory from the honor of God, and the mediatorship of Christ ; and having in this way obtained an easy triumph over phantoms of their own creation, they proclaim a victory over Popery which their charity has placed in exactly the same predicament as the poor fellow in the mask. That such conduct is calculated to keep alive prejudice against us, we know from experience, but we have yet to learn that the refutation of what we *do not* believe is a rational or likely method of proving to us the erroneousness of what we *do* believe.

We are well aware that those who thus act towards us, constitute but a small section of the Protestant body, the majority of whom are incapable *wilful* misrepresentation. But they are probably for this very reason the more liable to be led into false conclusions by the daring misrepresentations of others. It is said, that by constant repetition, a man will in time come to take his own falsehood for truth. Can we be surprised then that our Protestant brethren should believe, what is continually dunned into their ears, that our doctrine of the invocation of angels and saints is absurd and impious ? With a view to remove such false impressions we shall here state our real doctrine, and leave it to candour and common sense to judge whether there be any thing in it absurd, superstitious or derogatory from the honor of God, and mediatorship of Christ.

The Catholic Church teaches that, 'the saints reigning with Christ, offer up their prayer to God for men ; that it is good and profitable suppliantly to invoke them ; and to have recourse to their prayers and assistance, in order to obtain favours from God, through his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who is our *only* Redeemer and Saviour.*' In accordance with this doctrine we believe that the saints in heaven, replenished with charity, pray for us their fellow-members here on earth, that they rejoice in our conversion : that seeing God, they see and know in him all things suitable to their happy state, and that God may be inclined to hear their requests made in our behalf, and for their sakes grant us many favours. We invoke their prayers in precisely the same sense as we do those of our brethren on earth. We ask them for neither grace nor salvation which we expect from the merits of Christ alone ; we merely solicit their friendly intercession for us with Christ who is our and their Saviour, our and their God, and *the Giver of all good gifts*. It is obvious to common sense that, in his capacity of Mediator, the prayers of the living should derogate from the glory and dignity of Christ no less than the intercession of the saints in heaven.

The atrocious charge of giving to creatures the honor due to the Creator, is so monstrous a calumny, implying such inconceivable stupidity and im-

* Con : Trent, Sess : XXV.

piety in the great majority of Christians, that it is difficult to suppose any sane person ever seriously believed it. The Catholic Church teaches that to acknowledge as God, or to honor as such, any creature, however exalted in dignity, would be to commit the heinous crime of idolatry. Therefore should any person maintain that it is lawful to pay such honor to the Virgin Mary, or any of the saints, he would err against the faith of the Church and cease to be a Catholic. God is the only object of supreme worship, and the whole of that inferior veneration which is paid to the saints, is directed to give sovereign honor to God alone, whose gifts their graces are. When therefore we honour the saints, in them and through them, we honor God, and Christ true God and true Man the Redeemer and Saviour of mankind, the King of the saints, and the Source of all sanctity and glory.

It is useless, some say, to pray to the saints because they cannot hear you. The assertion is wholly gratuitous. It is true we do not know the manner in which the knowledge of what passes on earth or in the minds of men is imparted to the saints and angels by God, neither do we know in what manner he imparted to Eliseus the knowledge of what took place between Geizi and the Syrian General Naaman. 'Was not my heart present when the man turned back from his chariot to meet thee? So now thou hast received money and received garments.' And what passed in the council chamber of the Syrian king, who imagined that his confidence had been betrayed, 'and calling together his servants, he said: Why do ye not tell me who it is that betrays me to the King of Israel? And one of his servants said: No one, My Lord, O King, but Eliseus the prophet, that is in Israel, telleth the King of Israel all the words that thou speaketh in thy privy chamber.' Nor how he made known to St. Peter the deception of Ananias and Sapphira. Surely then if the Divine Being could convey to his servants while on earth a perfect knowledge of actions which eye could not see, nor of which the ear could receive the faintest information; he must be equally able to impart similar communications unto the spirits of the blessed, who are now much more susceptible of receiving these revelations. Our Redeemer assures us that there shall be joy in heaven upon one sinner that doth penance, and it is evident that the blessed in heaven could not rejoice at a thing unless they knew it; and their joy is a proof of the interest they feel in our happiness.

That the angels (and the saints in heaven 'are equal to angels, and are the children of God.'—St. Luke xx. 36.) are employed by the Almighty in executing various works of kindness to man, is manifest from numberless passages from scripture. At one time we find them on earth supplicating the Deity in favour of whole kingdoms;* at another we find them in heaven offering up the prayers for the saints,† at another conducting an army in its various movements;‡ at another announcing the intended redemption of mankind;§ at another rescuing the Redeemer of the world himself from danger, ministering to him in his wants, and consoling him in his sorrows;|| at another performing the same kind office to private individuals, accompanying them on their journeys, and guarding them in all their ways.¶ We find Jacob imploring upon the children of

* Zacharias I. 12. † Rev. V. 8. ‡ Exod. XXII. 20. § Luke I. XXII. Matt. II. || Tobias: V. Psalm XCI. 11. ¶ Gen. XLVIII. 16.

Joseph the blessing of the angel that had redeemed him from all evil.* From the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, it is evident, that the former even in his place of torments, though not a man, we may suppose, of very benevolent feelings, felt an anxiety for his brethren on earth and even interceded with Abraham in their behalf, and it further appears that Abraham knew what took place on earth. Had the scriptures come down to a later period when the apostles themselves and other zealous founders of Christianity were admitted into heaven, we should probably have found in them more ample information on this subject. But this information is abundantly supplied by the early writers of Christianity, and by the concurrent belief and practice of the universal Church. We are aware that Protestants generally condemn the Fathers as Papists; for our own part, however, we cannot help, thinking that the disciples of the apostles, and their immediate successors, were as likely to know the real doctrine which our Saviour taught, and the true meaning of the scripture, as our modern crew of self-constituted gospel expounders who take the vagaries of their own heated imaginations for the word of God.

Those who have no respect for the authority of the Fathers of our Church, will doubtless receive with becoming deference and respect that of the Fathers of the Protestant Church, or of the so-called Reformation. Well then let us hear what old Martin Luther says on the subject. 'The saints,' says he, 'can do all things, and through them God will grant you as much as you believe that you shall receive from them.'† 'I have never denied that we are assisted by the merits and prayers of the saints as some miserable wretches have maliciously endeavoured to impute to me?‡ 'On the intercession of the saints, I think with all the Christian Church, and I am of opinion that the saints are to be honoured and invoked by us. Who could contradict the wonderful prodigies that God works still in our days, at their tombs?§ 'Some one,' says he again, 'might ask me here of what use the saints will be to us? Make the same use of them as you do of your neighbour, you say to him; pray to God for me, say to them Saint Peter, pray for me.¶ 'The saints,' say Ecolampadius, 'are inflamed with charity in heaven, they cease not to pray for us. What harm therefore in asking them to do that which we believe to be agreeable to God, although he has never commanded us to do so? It is what has been done by Chrysostom and by Gregory of Nazianzum in his panegyric on St. Cyprian, and what has been practised by almost all the churches of the East and the West.¶¶ 'I do not deny,' says Montague, Bishop of Norwich, 'that the saints are mediators, as they are called, of prayer and intercession. They interpose with God by their supplications, and meditate by their prayers.** 'Nay,' says he, striking at the root of the principal objection made by our adversaries, 'I grant that Christ is not wronged in his mediation, it being no impiety to say,' as Papists do, 'Holy Mary, pray for me! For I can see no absurdity in nature, no incongruity unto analogy of faith, no repugnance at all to holy scripture, much less impiety to say holy angel guardian, pray for me!†† So much for Protestant authorities, which we quote more out of curiosity than respect.

* Gen XLVIII. 16. † On the six precepts C. V. ‡ Reply to the theol; of Lovain.
§ In *perorationem quorundam articularum*. ¶ Sermon on the feast of St. John the Baptist.
¶ Rom St. J. Chryso. ** Antidote, page 21. †† Invoc: of Saints page 113 and 97.

Having thus stated our doctrine of the invocation of saints and angels at much greater length than we intended, we shall conclude by observing that Catholics are by no means taught so to rely on the prayers of others as to neglect their own duty to God, in imploring his Divine mercy and goodness; in mortifying the deeds of the flesh; in despising the world; in loving and serving God and their neighbours; in following the footsteps of Christ our Lord, who is the way, the truth, and the life; to whom be honor and glory for ever—Amen.

ON THE AUTHORITY OF HOLY WRIT IN MATTERS OF FAITH.

It is a question of the last importance to know, what is the authority of Sacred Scripture in points of doctrine, or rather, what use should be made of its authority.

Protestants generally maintain that Holy Writ *is the only rule of Faith*, the sole deposit of revealed doctrines; and that it is by the aid of reason, a natural light, assisted by divine grace, that we discover the true and genuine sense of the sacred text: whence it follows that it is reason in the end, or *private judgment*, that is the *only umpire* of the creed of every Christian.

Anglicans felt sorely this consequence, and steered a middle course. Their ablest divines, Bullus, Fell, Bishop of Oxford, Pearson Bishop of Chester, Dodwell, Bingham, &c. have proved with sound arguments, that in order to discover the true meaning of Holy Writ, we must consult the Fathers of the Church, especially those of the four first centuries, faithful organs of Apostolical tradition. They were compelled to argue thus, in order to refute the Socinians.

The latter, born in the bosom of Protestantism, pushed the principle of the Reformers, as far as it could go. According to them (said they) it is reason, or a natural light, that is to determine the genuine sense of the Sacred Scriptures. Consequently, when Scripture seems to teach doctrines contrary to reason, such as the Trinity, Incarnation, Redemption, &c. we must give its expressions the bearing that is most conformable to reason. God, they continued, cannot have revealed truths contrary to reason, while it was he gave us the latter for our guide.

Founded on the last mentioned principle, Deists conclude, that as all revelations teach doctrines contrary to reason, none can be admitted. This gradation of errors and unavoidable consequences plainly demonstrate the falsity of the Protestant system.

Catholics hold that Holy Writ *is a rule of faith*, but not the only one, that alone it does not suffice to determine our belief; that in order to penetrate its true meaning, we must consult the tradition of the church, tradition attested by the decrees of councils, by the Fathers, by the Liturgy and public prayers, by the acts of divine worship. Here are the proofs that they adduce:

1°. We cannot better discover the manner in which the faithful should be instructed, than by considering the conduct of Jesus Christ and that of the Apostles and their successors. Now Jesus Christ after telling his disciples, ‘As the Father hath sent me, so do I send you,’ (Jo. xx. 21.) orders them to teach all nations: he does not bid them to write, nor did he himself write any thing: of his apostles, at least six have left no work; and

it cannot be demonstrated that those six commanded the faithful to procure the works of the other Apostles, and still less that they exhorted them to peruse the Old Testament. In the same manner that Jesus Christ had, said : ' Whatsoever I have heard of my Father, I have made known to you, (John xv. 15), in like manner St. Paul said to the Corinthians, ' I have received of the Lord, that which also I *delivered* unto you,'* (1 Cor. xi. 23). And he thus addressed a pastor, whom he was commissioning to teach : ' And the things, which thou hast heard of me by many witnesses, the same commend to *faithful men*, who shall be fit to teach others also, (2d. Tim. ii. 2.) It would have been much shorter to have said, ' Place the *scriptures* in their hands.' But here Le Clerc rejoins (*Histoire Eccles.* A. D. 57.) that it is credible the apostles not only instructed the faithful by word of mouth, but that they furnished them likewise with copies of the gospels. This is *credible* indeed to a Protestant, who is interested in supposing it ; but it is by no means so to an educated man, who seeks the truth with simplicity ; because 1st, such a supposition is at variance with the apostle's instructions, which we have quoted. 2dly, The books of the New Testament were not all written until the close of the first century, viz. sixty-seven years after the death of Jesus Christ. 3dly, An Apostle who had set out to preach in Persia, India, Italy or Gaul, could not possibly have had at hand the books written in Egypt, Palestine or Asia Minor, nor obtain a sufficient number of copies for distribution among all the Christian societies he formed. 4thly, Books were very little studied by the vulgar, and very few were those who knew how to read. 5thly, Irenæus attests, that there were Churches or societies of Christians at his time, that possessed *no portion* of the Bible, and nevertheless conserved their faith pure by means of tradition. These are all positive *facts*, much stronger than the *conjectures* of the Protestants.

(To be continued.)

PLANTING OF A CROSS.

Trinculo, keep a good tongue in your head—
The poor monster's my subject and he shall not
Suffer indignity.—*Tempest*.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—It was not without pain that I saw in your first number an account of the ' Planting of a Cross' taken from the *Dublin Review*, which had copied it from *L' Ami de la Religion*. If you had intended the fact to meet only the eyes of Catholics who would understand the meaning of the ceremony, I should not suspect you of any evil and malicious design against my interesting friend the 'different religious denomination' Gazette. But knowing, as you must have done, that it could not escape his Argus eyes, I have a strong suspicion that you wished to put my many-headed monster to death of laughter. For, ignorant of everything Catholic, though conversant in all the secret mysteries of the *Protestant fabric* of *Poper*y, what else could he do, on seeing your short tale of a Cross erected, but chuckle to suffocation over it as an event *big with importance*

* NOTE.—The word *tradition* originally signifies a delivery or consignment.

and wonder. Oh! How I can fancy my poor Bully-monster as soon as he caught a glimpse of the *astounding* fact, bursting out into a downright Hydra-laugh (more dreadful by far than the horse-laugh) and roaring with all his mouths, till he shed tears from all his eyes, and shook in all his bones. I advise you, Mr. Editor, to be more cautious in your stories: 'Keep a good tongue in your head,' for the compound-religion monster is my Bully-friend and instead of the natural death, that he must soon meet with, he shall not die a premature one by being choked by you in all his throats. I am convinced that you have a deep Editor's design on his life. Now 'by this hand' I will not permit you, in an unfair manner, to hurt a single hair of one of his heads. For he does infinite service to my health by putting me every week into a right merry mood, whether he is pleased to relax all his faces into one broad universal grin, or (which is more usual and comical too) chooses to pour out against poor Papists a volley of obstreperous abuse at variance with all reason and history. So, Mr. Editor, I mean to keep a sharp eye on your file of news, in order to detect any naked fact that might be apt to kill my Bully-monster with laughing. If I should find one again, I will instantly seize it, and dress it out with a little sober explanation, before any fatal effects can ensue; just as I mean now to do your 'Great assemblage of people witnessing the planting of a Cross.'

The 'planting of a Cross' then is not a mere ceremony in which a cross is fixed in the ground for 'damnable-idolatry' Papists to worship. This indeed would be a strange and wonderful event, because it has never yet occurred. Neither does it partake of the character of those holy methodistical field-preachments, whereat the brothers and sisters evangelical are by turns shut up, a score at a time, in a pinfold, and subjected to the preaching-operation of two ministers raised upon a scaffolding, who, like a double-electric machine, work and play upon them, till they become so thoroughly charged and evangelized, as to leap and shout, and dance and tumble like mad beings, emitting and shooting out Gospel-sparks on all who come within reach of them. This also in good sooth is a most marvellous scene, if it has not been over-wrought by Mrs. Trollope. The 'planting of the Cross' has nothing of all this in it; like every other Catholic ceremony, it is a rite as modest and sober as it is imposing and beneficial. The intelligence of the 'planting a Cross' tells those who are acquainted with Catholic discipline, that the people of several villages have been invited to come to some convenient spot, where (because no church could hold the multitudes), they have been for a fortnight instructed three times a day on their duties to God and their neighbour, reminded of the end of their being and of the great truths of eternity, cleansed from sin by sincere sorrow and humble confession, and prepared to appear as guests at the holy communion-table. At the conclusion of this spiritual exercise, a Cross is erected as a trophy of their victory over themselves, and a memorial to put them in mind of their Redeemer, through whose merits it had been won.

In good old Catholic days, the custom prevailed in England of planting crosses on the high ways and on the tops of rising grounds. Many of them are still to be seen; and though, with a view, I presume, to efface every object that might remind them of their suffering Saviour, the piety of the Reformers destroyed the rest, yet we find

that the places where they stood, still keep obstinately their old names. Hence we have Charing-cross and a thousand other *ings* and *tong*s and *dales*, with a cross tacked to the end of 'em. On the spot where the cross once raised the sign of Faith and Piety, we now too often find a Public House built, with a sign hanging out from it, of the old Saracens' head, or the Bear's head, or Duke Wellington's, or the Red Lion, or the White Boar, or the Two-necked Swan, or the Pig in armour, or any sort of a monster that may issue from the fancy of a 'many-headed Hydra.' Thus instead of the Psalm 'De Profundis,' chanted formerly at the cross, our ears are now ravished with the lewd song of revelry; instead of the pilgrim piously stopping (vile superstition!) to *tell* his beads on his knees, we now see groups of idle strollers *telling* their obscene jests; instead of the traveller (rank Popery!) blessing himself, as he passed the stone-cross for the sake of a drop of spiritual grace on his way, we now behold the swain hastening forward his waggon, as soon as he catches a glimpse of the tavern's cheering sign, and smacking his lips in preparation to quaff the good liquor, which contains all the *spirituality* he thinks needful for him on his journey. Oh! Most holy, Oh! Most Godly Reformation! for what great and singular benefits are we not indebted to thee! Thou art as much deserving of my love, as my Bully-Compound-Religion-Monster is of my protection from the black designs of the Editor of the *Expositor*.

STEPHANO.

THE CALCUTTA CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—Your cotemporary of the *Advocate* in one of his early numbers was pleased to say, that the primary object for which his paper was established 'is the dissemination of information on the character, advancement, and influence of Popery,' and in his last publication he openly avows that it is his object to reclaim Catholics!

Pray Sir, have you been able to discover who is this mighty champion of Protestantism? That he is not a member of the Church of England is self-evident. Who then is this Sir Oracle? Is he merely a Scripture Christian? What is his creed? To which of the innumerable Protestant Sects does he belong? All that he has yet declared is that the *Advocate* is 'conducted by Gentlemen of *different* religious denominations!' A LEGION for they are many! Although professing *different* faith, dis-united, divided and separated in their tenets, yet I presume, they have merged their differences to effect one object—to *reclaim*; or to be plain, to *proselytise the Catholics of India*!! Grand object, indeed! But to which of the *different religious denominations* would this hydra-headed champion reclaim us? If the Editor of the *Advocate* will condescend to answer this, without evasion, he, I am sure, will be 'amply re-paid for his transient labours.'

NO DECEPTION!

17th July, 1839.

G

CATHOLIC DOCTRINES MISREPRESENTED.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR*.

SIR,—The editor of the *Christian Advocate* in his paper of this morning would fain make his readers believe that he has not misrepresented the doctrines of the Catholic Church. I beg leave to extract the following passage from the *Christian Advocate* of the 15th ultimo, and put it to your readers to say whether it is a misrepresentation, or worse —.* There can be but one opinion on the subject, and that opinion is, that the editor in publishing it, wilfully gave insertion to what he knew to be false, to serve the purposes of heterodoxy. Here is the blasphemous extract :—

‘But let us consider the awful manner in which this sacrifice [of the mass] is offered up, and that by men who are endowed with the scriptures, and who say they take the scriptures for their guide. Now this which is offered up as a sacrifice, is an image, made by man, from a piece of wood; this image is nailed to a cross, and then the priest, a sinner like ourselves, will say he has the power to make this wooden sacrifice undergo all the pains our blessed Lord underwent upwards of 1800 years past. Let me ask, where is the priest or any man living who can find one word in the Bible giving him such authority or power? I may answer, not one. The Popish Church declares that this sacrifice which is offered up in the mass, is not a simple figure or remembrance of the passion and death of our Saviour, but an actual celebration of his death; for the Laity are supposed to believe that this image, (which by the priest’s power has become able to feel all the pains our human bodies are capable of) sweats blood, at which the priest goes to the altar and kisses it. Then this Jesus is siezed, bound, stripped and scourged, at which the priest washes the tips of his fingers at the side of the altar. Jesus is then crowned with thorns and treated as a mock-king, at which the priest says some secret prayers. Jesus is then condemned, laid on the cross, nailed, the cross raised, bows his head and dies.’

13th July, 1839.

A DESPISER OF FALSEHOOD.

* Our correspondent must pardon us for expunging a few words.—Although we do not emblazon it in our motto, yet we hope to manifest ‘in all things charity.’—ED.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR*.

SIR,—I was not a little surprised at seeing a note from the editor of the *Advocate* of last Saturday, allusive to Dr. Baines, the Vicar Apostolic of the western district of England, as if that prelate were a ‘non-image-worshipping papist.’ I therefore through the medium of your columns beg to rectify this error, and to inform the editor, in question that I am a personal acquaintance of his Lordship’s, and that *he is* an image-worshipping papist equally as much as

Your obedient servant,

July 16, 1839.

NOT-TO-BE-FOOLED.

ON IMAGES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR*.

SIR,—The Protestants charge us Catholics with Idolatry though we deny the charge, and solemnly declare that we never pay Divine Adoration to Images. It would certainly be Idolatry, if we adored, honored and

served Images as Gods; and like the Pagans of old gave the Glory of the eternal God to the Works of Men's hands; or if we ascribed to the Images the properties which are peculiar to God alone.

There are three kinds of Adoration; viz.

1. Adoration Divine.
2. Adoration Human.
3. Adoration* Relative.

We pay Adoration Divine to God alone, and worship him as our Creator, our Redeemer and last end; and we consider it as the worst of treasons and greatest of crimes to give his Homage to any creature whatever. Our love and adoration are due to God of Mercies, and to him alone for all his inestimable blessings and favours.

Adoration Human is paid to Kings and Dignitaries by kneeling and kissing their hands, which practice is still subsisting in England, and was observed at the Coronation of Queen Victoria.

Adoration Relative—We honor the Images of Christ and his Saints with an inferior and relative honor, because the honour given them is referred to the things they represent; but we do not indeed most ignorantly and wickedly give divine honors to lifeless and senseless Images, as the Protestants unfairly represent. The use and worship of Images are as ancient as the Christian Religion itself. Images are placed at the Altar as helps to devotion, and not as objects of worship. We pray before Images to keep us from distraction, but not to them, for we know they can neither see, nor hear, nor help us. Before the invention of the art of printing and when few could read, Images were placed in Churches to bring to the recollection of the beholders the originals which they are intended to represent. For example, 'the image of Christ Jesus crucified, awakens in us, when we cast our eyes upon it, the lively remembrance of him,' who has loved us so as to lay down his life for our salvation. 'Whilst the contemplation of the Image nourishes in the soul this useful recollection, we are of course inclined naturally to declare by some external expression, the tenderness of our gratitude; and by humbling ourselves before the representation, to testify the willingness of our submission to the divine original.'

We simply invoke the blessed Virgin Mary and the Saints to pray for us, to obtain our requests, our petitions, and the compliance of our lawful desires. These holy persons, 'whose acknowledged sanctity has procured for them through the Grace and Merits of Christ the friendship of God and the happiness of heaven,' did graciously obtain for us here below our just requests and desires, and is it unreasonable to hope that their prayers in our behalf would prove more efficacious now that they behold God face to face, and enjoy without reserve his friendship, and his love?

The Blessed Virgin was certainly the Protectress of the Infant Jesus, that is during his human infancy, and we are not justly chargeable with the absurdity of using the term in any other sense, such as still considering her the Protectress of Jesus after he had returned to his Glory.

JACQUES.

* The word adoration is now almost obsolete in the last two senses, in which our correspondent has used it.—Ed.

Selections.

DECLARATION OF THE CATHOLIC BISHOPS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

(Continued from No. 2, page 28.)

SECTION IV.

On the Charge of Idolatry and Superstition.

Ignorance or malice has gone so far as to charge the Catholic Church with **IDOLATRY** in the sacrifice of the Mass—in the adoration (as it is called) of the Virgin Mary, and in the worship of the Saints, and of the images of Christ and of the Saints; and with **SUPERSTITION**, in invoking the Saints, and in praying for souls in purgatory. Now idolatry consists in giving to any creature that supreme adoration, honour, or worship which is due only to Almighty God.

The Catholic Church teaches that idolatry is one of the greatest crimes that can be committed against the majesty of God; and every true member of this Church shudders at the idea of such a crime, and feels grievously injured by so horrid an imputation.

But it is said that Catholics adore the elements of bread and wine in the Mass: that they adore the Virgin Mary; that they adore the cross; and that they worship the saints and the images of Christ and of the saints. Before we repel these horrid imputations, in the sense in which they are made, we must explain the different meanings of the word *adoration*, *honour*, and *worship*, that the calumnious charge, and its denial, may be understood in the same explained sense.

We find that in the language of the sacred scripture, in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin,* as well as in the language of the ancient liturgies of the Christian Church, these words, adoration, honour, and worship, are ambiguous terms, and are used in different senses, according to the nature of the object to which the act, implied by the term, is directed, and according to the intention of him who performs the act. Hence we find them used as relating sometimes to God, and sometimes to creatures. Although, in modern times, the exclusive idea of that supreme homage, which is due only to God, is attached by some to the words *adoration* and *worship*; yet these words may still be retained by others, in a different meaning, without affording the remotest cause for the imputation of idolatry. In this different meaning they are still retained, in the unchanged language of the ancient liturgies used in the Catholic Church.

The words *adoration* and *worship*, are equally referred, sometimes to God, and sometimes to creatures, as is the word *honour*. Now because we are commanded in scripture to *honour* God, and to *honour* the king; and children are commanded to *honour* their parents: it does not follow that the honour due to the king, or to parents, is the same as that which we owe to God. To God we owe supreme and sovereign honour, such as it would be a crime to pay to any creature. To the king, we owe the highest civil honour. To parents, children owe the honour of filial respect and obedience. How unjust would it be to say, that because a subject honours the king, he pays him that supreme and sovereign honour which is due only to God! The same is to be said of the terms *adoration* and *worship*, as used in former times, and sometimes used at present in the language of the Catholic Church. To *adore*, even according to modern usage, often means no more than to express extreme affection or respect. To *worship* (in the translation of the Bible published at Oxford) is therein used to signify inferior as well as supreme worship. In the first book of Chronicles, xxix. 20, we read in that edition, that the assembly bowed down their heads and worshipped the Lord (Jehovah) and the king. Did they worship the king, with the same supreme worship which they paid to God?

* See in Hebrew (Prov. iii. 9, and Exod. xx. 12), (Deut. xxviii. 47 and 48). (Ps. xevi. 9, and 1, alias 3d Kings, i. 23). In Greek, Gen. xxiv. 26, and Gen. xlix. 8. In Latin Adorare, Ps. xxviii. 2, and Gen. xxiii. 7, and 4th, alias 2 Kings ii. 15.

Certainly not. When a man says to the women he takes to wife, 'with my body I thee *worship*,' can this be called idolatry? Surely nothing can be more unfair than arguments drawn from ambiguous terms, construed in a sense disavowed by those against whom the arguments are employed.

We answer, therefore, that if by the terms *adoration*, *honour*, and *worship*, be understood that *supreme* adoration, honour, and worship which is due only to God; Catholics do not adore, nor honour, nor worship any other, than the one, only, true, and living God, the Creator and Sovereign Lord of the universe: they do not, in this sense, adore, nor honour, nor worship the Virgin Mary, nor any of the saints, nor the cross, nor images, nor any other creature whatsoever.

In the Mass, Catholics do offer supreme adoration, not to the elements of bread and wine, which they hold not to be present after the consecration; but to Jesus Christ, the Son of God, whom they believe to be truly, really and substantially present, under the appearances only of bread and wine after the consecration, and change thereby of the elements into his body and blood. To adore Christ, by an act of supreme adoration, is no idolatry; because he is truly God, and consequently a legitimate object of supreme worship.

But if Catholics, using the ancient language of the Christian Church, are said,

1st. To *worship* the saints; this worship must be understood to be only an *inferior* worship, honour, and respect, paid to them proportionate to the limited perfections and excellencies which God has bestowed upon them, but this worship is infinitely below that supreme worship which they pay to God. Catholics acknowledge no perfection or excellencies in any saint, not even in the Blessed Virgin Mary, which they do not profess to be the work and gift of God in them. So that in honouring the saints, they celebrate the works of God, and consequently give glory to him. Whatever act of religious veneration we pay to the saints, is ultimately referred to God.

2nd. To *adore* the cross: this word, if applied to the cross itself, means no more than an inferior and relative respect paid to the instrument of our redemption; but if in view of the cross it be applied to Christ himself, then it means, as it ought to mean, an act of supreme adoration.

3rd. To *worship* the images of Christ or of the saints; the word is here again understood by Catholics only of an *inferior* and relative respect shewn to images, in consideration of the respect due to the objects which they represent, and to which the respect, shewn to the images, is referred. In this sense respect is shewn to the statue or to the throne of the king, in consideration of the majesty of the personage to whom they relate. An insult offered to his statue would be considered as intended to be offered to the king himself. In this sense a son respects the image or picture of his parent; a parent that of his child; a friend that of his friend; not for any intrinsic virtue in the material substance or work of art, but because it relates to, and brings to his mind, the object of his respect and affection.

To condemn this relative regard for images, or pictures, would be to condemn the very feelings of nature. To charge the Catholic with idolatry because the term *worship*, meaning only an *inferior* and *relative* regard, is found in the ancient and modern liturgies of the Church, is not consistent with candour and charity.

The charge that the Catholic Church sanctions the praying to images is a calumny, and carries with it an imputation of stupidity too gross to be noticed. Catholics sometimes pray *BEFORE* images, because they serve to collect their thoughts, and fix their attention in their meditations and prayers; but they are not, on that account, to be supposed to be so void of reason and sense as to pray to the image: for they know that in it there is no virtue or power; and that it can neither see, nor hear, nor help them.

Catholics do solicit the intercession of the angels and saints reigning with Christ in heaven. But in this, when done according to the principles and spirit of the Catholic Church, there is nothing of superstition, nothing which is not

consistent with true piety. For the Catholic Church teaches her children not to pray to the saints, as to the authors or givers of divine grace; but only to solicit the saints in heaven to pray for them, in the same sense as St. Paul desired the faithful on earth to pray for them.

Catholics, according to the faith and pious practice of the Christian Church from the age of the apostles, do pray for the release and eternal rest of departed souls, who may be detained for a time in a state of punishment on account of their sins, but in this we cannot discover even the shadow of superstition.

By invoking the intercession of the saints in heaven, and by praying for the suffering souls in purgatory, Catholics exercise acts of that communion of charity, which subsists between the members of the mystical body of Christ; the principle of which communion they profess to believe, when they say, 'I believe the holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints.'

After this explanation and declaration, we hope that our countrymen will never be so unjust or so uncharitable as to charge Catholics with idolatry or superstition, nor be so illiberal as to attempt to give a colour to these injurious charges, by fixing an exclusive meaning to terms, which, in the language of scripture, Christian antiquity, and common usage, bear different senses in different circumstances.

(To be continued.)

INTELLIGENCE.

LONDON.—We understand that subscriptions are in progress for the erection of a magnificent Roman Catholic Cathedral in the western part of the metropolis, in the Gothic style, to be decorated in the interior with the most finished specimens of the arts of painting and sculpture, to contain 10,000 persons, and to form externally one of the noblest architectural ornaments of the empire. It is said that the Pope is to come over to consecrate the cathedral when finished, and it is calculated that the edifice will altogether cost about 150,000*l.*—*Times*.

HUNGARY.—There are a good many Protestants scattered through Hungary, and in these mountain districts they abound. The vale of Sullov, for example, is principally peopled by them; and their presence is marked, both there and elsewhere, by a more than common display of the traces of industry around them. It is said, too, that they are in general more moral than their Romish neighbours, and it is certain that they are better educated; indeed, education among the Catholic portion of the Hungarian peasantry is entirely neglected. But I am bound to add, that from the Catholics, though the dominant party in the state, the Protestants receive no annoyance. The most perfect harmony, on the contrary prevails; for no person considers it necessary to fall out with his neighbours because of differences in their creed; and the very clergy of the rival churches exercise all the rites of hospitality one towards another. As I shall have occasion to revert to this subject by and by, when it will fall in more naturally with the order of my journal, I must for the present content myself with remarking, that the spirit of tolerance is more conspicuous among the Romanists than among their rivals. I never heard a Catholic speak with a sneer at the faith of the Protestants; I never heard a Protestant speak otherwise than contemptuously of the ignorance and superstition of his Catholic neighbour.—*Gleig's Hungary, &c.*

PRUSSIA.—The Prussian Government has ordered judicial proceedings to be instituted against another Catholic Prelate, the Bishop of Culm, because of his having, in imitation of his colleagues at Cologne and Posen, published a pastoral letter, enjoining his clergy in all cases of mixed marriages, to conform to the orders of the Sovereign Pontiff, and not to the laws of the land.

SAXONY.—CONVERSIONS to the Catholic religion are of very common occurrence in Germany, particularly in Saxony. M. Ringmann, a student at Halle, has lately abjured Protestantism, and many other students are expected to fol-

low his example. A student in theology, named Bergmann, has also embraced the Catholic faith. A lady, formerly a singer at the Opera in Berlin, lately renounced Protestantism, and has since entered as a religious the convent of Marienstern, near Bautzen.

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE.—The Right Rev. Dr. Griffith, and two chaplains, arrived at Capetown, Cape of Good Hope, early in May, 1838, and celebrated mass in the military barracks, where he has been accommodated until a chapel is built. The Rev. Mr. Bourke, O. S. F., late of Limerick, one of his chaplains, is appointed to the mission at Grahamstown.

CEYLON.—On the 14th of January last, after high mass, the Superier and Vicar General of the mission of Ceylon, D. Vincent du Rosaire, and six priests, held a meeting in the church of St. Lucie, at which the Vicar General produced two briefs from the Pope nominating him bishop and Vicar Apostolic of the island of Ceylon. These briefs were read by the secretary of the mission, and explained in different languages to the congregation. The bishop elect afterwards addressed an allocution to the clergy and congregation; after which the *Te Deum* was chaunted. The congregation manifested great joy on the occasion. The consecration was however delayed, in consequence of some difficulties, till new instructions should be received, from the Holy See. There are about 100,000 Catholics in Ceylon, which has hitherto depended upon the Portuguese archbishop of Goa, who supplied the mission with native priests of the order of Theatins, educated at Goa; but his Holiness wishes to make Ceylon an independent vicariate.

HOLLAND.—The Dutch government, so long anti-Catholic, has now become anti-Protestant. It seems that Holland is overrun with sectaries of all sorts, whose doctrines are considered subversive of order, at least of the established order of things. Some of the leaders have been imprisoned, and so severe has been the confinement of one Van der Goesen of Almskerk, that he expired in prison at the end of six months. Many have been subjected to heavy fines for celebrating their worship, and even women have not been allowed to teach the new doctrines with impunity. The pastors of the canton of Vaud have petitioned for tolerance to the new sects, and, we believe, the English Dissenters have also interfered. Persecution can never be justified, and it comes with a peculiar bad grace from the advocates of the principle of private judgment. Yet we are bound to admit, that, if the new doctrines are evidently subversive of order, the Dutch government has an undoubted right to protect itself.

KEEPSAKE OF AN OLD MISSIONARY TO A LATE CONVERT.

(On the Happiness of being a Member of the Catholic Church.)

God the Father is the Projector and Founder of the Catholic Church; God the Son is her Redeemer; God the Holy Ghost her Sanctifier. The blessed Virgin is her first born, and her solid link with God; the Angels are her Protectors, the Saints her Intercessors, the Patriarchs her Stem, the Prophets her Oracles, the Apostles her Foundation. The Pope is her Head; the Cardinals are her Counsel, the Bishops her Shepherds, the Priests her Voice, the Deacons her Stewards, the Subdeacons her Servants, the Martyrs her Witnesses, the Doctors her Light, the Confessors her Support, the Religious Orders her Succour, the Virgins her Ornament, the Faithful her Children.—Baptism is her Cradle, Confirmation her Strength, the most Holy Sacrament of the Altar her Food; Penance and Extreme Unction are her Remedies, Holy Order is her Jurisdiction, Matrimony her Nursery. The ten Commandments of God are her Walls, her own Precepts her Ramparts, the Evangelical Counsels her Outworks.—The Body of Jesus Christ is her Treasure, Infallibility her Characteristic; the Gospel is her Warrant, Unity her Centre, Holiness her Brightness, Universality her Seal; the Holy Scripture is her Proof, Tradition her Solidity.—The Councils are her Authority.—Truth is her Rule, Meekness her Spirit, Zeal her Spring, Prayer her Shield of Protection, Patience her Victory.—Faith

is her Gate, Hope her Progress, Charity her Consummation.—The Grace of our Saviour is her Riches, Chastity her Bloom.—Justice is her Beauty, Prudence her Eye, Fortitude her Arm, Temperance her Body.—The Just are her Joy, Sin is her Horror, Sinners are the object of her Compassion.—The Heterodox are her Sorrow, the Jews her living Witnesses upon earth; the Conversion of all these the constant subject of her sighs and prayers to God.—The perseverance of her Members is her Desire, the glorification of God her Pride.—The most Holy Trinity is the object of her Adoration, the slaughtered Man-God her Sacrifice, the Ceremonies are her Adornment. The Earth is her Exile, the Cross her Portion, Heaven her Term.—Scandals are her Grief, Penance is her Comfort, the Indulgences are her Liberality.—Jesus Christ is her Spouse, his Presence her Glory, the End of the World is the day of her Coronation.—Her Combat is on Earth, her Sufferings are in Purgatory, and her Triumph in Heaven. And I? Am I a living member of this Church? Am I her joy?—Yes; if I but join divine Love to my divine Faith, and Fervour in the Love of my God. Ah! sweet Jesus!—Grant me thy gracious assistance, and grant it me until my end!—Amen.

FLOWERS FROM THE HOLY FATHERS.

No. I.

(From the Catholic Magazine, for March 1838.)

‘Firmum est mihi propositum nunquam ridendi, quosque audiam ex ore Dei verba illa, Venite, benedicti Patris mei; neque flere desistam donec liber sim ab illa sententia. Ita maledicti in ignem æternum. Ergo, dilectissimi, cum metu et tremore, vestram salutem operamini.’—*Sti. Bernardi, L. de Consid. ad Eugen. Pap. c. 22.*

’Tis my resolve to place no trust
On aught that yields or turns to dust;
No smile of satisfied content,
No passing joy shall slack my bent,
No lure of mirth shall come me near
Until those happy words I hear—
‘Ye blessed of my father come,
Enter your everlasting home!’

’Tis my resolve to mourn and weep,
To watch by day, to start from sleep,
To fast in fear, no rest to take,
With trembling still and fear to quake,
Until—but not to me—are said
Those bitter words, of awful dread,
Blown new by ever-quenchless ire!’
‘Depart, ye cursed, into fire,

’Tis my resolve, that dreadful day,
To fear and fear again alway,
Till purified by penance true,
And steeped in sorrow ever new,
My wandering heart to Thee return:
To Thee—my God—its incense burn,
Till final perseverance given,
I pass from earth to enter Heaven.’

Any profit which may arise from this publication, will be devoted to the Catholic Free Schools, at Calcutta.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor, care of Messrs. W. Rushton and Co.

Printed by Messrs. W. Rushton and Co., for the Proprietors. Price one rupee per month, or ten rupees per annum in advance.

THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

'One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.'

No. IV.

JULY 27, 1839.

VOL. I.

The swart star on us now more sparely looks.

MILTON.

Before the system of Copernicus, the laws of Kepler and the grand theory of Newton had been discovered, there was a philosopher who ventured to maintain, that night was caused, not as it was generally supposed by the absence of the sun, but by clusters of dark stars, which after sunset began to emit and pour forth obscurity upon the earth. Without pretending either to revive this fanciful theory of light, or to set it up in opposition to the system, which is now generally received, we have no doubt, in the moral hemisphere, whence our ingenious philosopher may have borrowed his idea, that there are many tenebrificous stars which are continually shedding their murky rays on whatever they wish to obscure; and though before the full brightness of Truth's glory they gradually hide their diminished heads, and at length disappear, yet if she chance to retire within a veil of clouds, they forthwith begin to ray out their black beams, and scatter abroad their stellar influence, which

disastrous twilight sheds
On half the nations, and with fear of change
Perplexes monarchs.

Truth, like the sun, is one, constant, everlasting. These swart stars have all the qualities of falsehood, and differ as much from each other as they are opposed to the light of truth. The beams of truth can take no other name but that of truth. The rays of these swart stars, so diversified in appearance and character, are in the language of the vulgar termed *lies*. The former, when decomposed, break indeed into various colours; — but colours, which retain the beauty and distinctness of truth, and paint, in the triple-coloured bow, the emblem of that divine mercy which it is the sole object of truth to display. But the dark rays of these anti-luminaries no sooner pass through the prismatic glass, than we see them, on the screen, decomposed into those foul varieties of darkness, which go by the names of pride, avarice, and sensuality. The component parts of the ray show the nature of the stars, and betray the hand which sowed them in our hemisphere.

They were first seen in the sky radiating night-beams on the heads of

men, when the true Church of Christ rose upon the benighted world, and commenced its ever-bright and ever-during course through the heavens. Soon Simon Magus, Cerinthus, and a Scorpion-constellation of Jews shot forth obscurity from their spheres, and combined their influence to blast and darken the bright character of the Apostles. Then successively rose Celsus and Porphyrius, the famous Julianum Sidus Apostata, Macedonius, Nestorius, Eutiches, Pelagius and Donatus, who were dark stars of the first magnitude, and became each in his turn Lord of the Ascendant. We have not dishonoured Arius by confounding him with the rest, because he far surpassed them, as well in the peculiar stygian murkiness of his rays, as in the myriads of smaller stars that darkened around him. What tongue will dare describe or what pen pourtray the gross palpable black rays which streamed from this huge constellation of the East, when it is borne in mind, that St. Athanasius, in a public council, was accused of having murdered a man who was present to prove himself living, and of having sinned with a woman, who, by the most unequivocal evidence, betrayed that she had never before seen him? When all these constellations had set, no primary dark star arose till the close of the 15th century, when Luther bursting into view, swept like a comet black and fierce along the western sky, trailing behind him a long dark shadowy tail, and 'with fear of change perplexing monarchs.' Beneath the awful shade of his rays, the kings of the earth tremble on their thrones, and grasp more firmly their sceptres; Rebellion walks forth; civil war deluges kingdoms with bloodshed; the Church beholds her altars thrown down, her temples pilaged, her priests massacred, and her doctrines obscured by the blackest rays that were ever emitted from any constellation in the Heretical Zodiac. When the first burst of violent animosity which fired the breasts of her enemies, had by degrees subsided into a temperate and well-regulated persecution, yet o'er the green isles of the western ocean, many a tenebrificous star was still seendarting his black rays around, and struggling for mastery with the beams of Truth. For three hundred years this contest has lasted; and though the light of Truth has chased away many of these opaque planets, and softened what was most baneful and malign in the aspect of others, yet from time to time is descried a straggling dark comet in the sky, shaking from his jetty locks a night-gloom thick as that of Erebus. Thus it was lately, when those two *wandering orbs* McGhee and Sullivan looked on Exeter-Hall, and with one gross, palpable, murky ray shot from their evangelical faces, wrapt on a sudden the whole place in the profoundest darkness. Thus too it was when Maria Monk—but no matter. They are gone; their dark rays are quenched; they are set to rise no more.

We had for a few years enjoyed in this country a sky somewhat clear of these night-scattering planets, when one day as the *Englishman* was looking over his journal, he suddenly perceived one of these dark rays stealing across it. Starting from his editorial chair and taking up his telescope that lay on his table, he surveyed the whole compass of the heavens; after a little while, down dropt the telescope from his eye, and he cried out with exultation, 'I have it! I have it! There it is yonder, right over the Baptist Mission Press—a whole cluster of them, by Jove!' We had previously from our observatory discovered this dark constellation, though we did not think it worth while to gazette it. For the last two months it has been above our horizon, looking with a very black and malignant aspect

on the old Catholic Church, and darting at it some of those singular swart rays, which are called '*lies*' in the unphilosophical language of the vulgar. Last week we detected several of these murky rays. It is right, however, to acknowledge, that they have not had the same deepshade since we rose and dawned on the cluster of swart stars, which form the constellation of the '*Christian Advocate*.' Nay the great star himself and his satellite Scotus, instead of obscuring us with direct gross rays, have chosen to darken out upon us with rays reflected from Nangle and Robertson. One direct ray however from his own dark orb he has levelled at us through the thin vapour of a note, and therewith attempted to embrown us down to the sable tint of the Heathen Hindoos; that no shade of difference might appear betwixt the HONOUR paid to the images of holy men who once lived on earth and now reign in heaven, and the SUPREME WORSHIP offered to the idols of false Gods, who neither exist nor ever did exist. Sigma, who is one of his revolving moons, has laboured with his dusky beams to create and conjure up countless phantoms of Jesuits in Spain and Portugal, where, for a century, this Order has had no permanent residence. Laicus Protestanticus is another moon; that, strange enough! has one side dark and the other bright, so that he casts a kind of doubtful twilight around him. With one of his faces he attacks *A Catholic Layman* for laying claim to salvation; with the other he shows that the Catholic *may* lay claim to it, since *he believes in all the truths, precepts, and doctrines of the Gospel*. On his dark side, he censures interrogatories: on his bright side, he, in beautiful contrast, puts forth a long streaming list of them. However no ray, emanating from this dark constellation, has the same deep tinge as on its first appearance; which leads us to hope, that 'ere long it will melt away and *disappear before the rising glory of the Expositor*.

CATHOLIC DEVOTION TO THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

Having in our last number fully explained our doctrine of the Invocation of Saints, it may appear superfluous to add anything on our devotion to the Blessed Virgin to which all we then said directly applies. We shall however offer a few words in further explanation of this part of our doctrine, which is so vehemently assailed by the adversaries of our religion, lest our silence respecting it might be imputed to any other cause than the true one.

It is a principle with Catholics to honor those whom God himself has deigned to honour by extraordinary marks of his favour; and we maintain that no creature ever received such transcendent honor and distinction from God as did the Blessed Virgin, in being chosen out of the whole human race to be the mother of our Divine Redeemer. Hence we pay her the highest honour which it is proper to give to a mere creature, for though we consider her the most honoured and exalted of all pure creatures, still she is *but a mere creature*, and consequently immeasurably removed from God. This doctrine is so obviously reasonable that a learned Protestant prelate, Dr. Pearson, could not refrain from declaring—'That we cannot bear too reverend a regard to the Mother of our Lord, so long as we give her not that worship which is due unto the Lord himself.' *Exposition of the*

creed: 'By the fact alone,' says Luther, 'of Mary becoming the mother of God, she has been loaded with admirable gifts surpassing all comprehension. What makes her glory and happiness is that one single person of the human race is raised above all others, that she has no equal, and that she has for son him who was already the Son of the Heavenly Father.' *On the nativ. of Mary*—and again, 'Let the sick man at the article of death cease not to invoke the Blessed Virgin, the Angels, the Apostles and all the Saints, that they would intercede for him before the Lord.' *Letter to G. Spalatin*. These remarks are in perfect accordance with our doctrine on the subject.

We honour the Blessed Mother of our Redeemer and invoke her intercession through which God has been pleased to grant many benefits. The constant doctrine and tradition of the Church through all ages renders us secure in this practice. The Protestant Century-Writers of Madgeburg trace it for us as high as the second century, and charge St. Irenæus with teaching it in the same manner that the Catholic Church does at this day. This is their remark upon those words of that great and primitive doctor: 'The Virgin Mary is made the Advocate of Eve,' that is, for men upon whom their first mother entailed a curse.' *St. Iren.* 1, 5. *Col.* 19, p. 352. St. Irenæus is one of the first in the list of the fathers; and this holy and wholesome devotion he learned from his masters, St. Polycarp and other immediate disciples of the Apostles; and the same has been delivered down by the pastors of the Church with the whole sacred deposit of our faith, without changing one iota; for its faith is always the same and unalterable. This is easy to prove with regard to the present point from the clear testimony of ancient and venerable fathers.

Some of our new Lights object to our calling the Blessed Virgin, Mother of God. This objection is neither new nor of their own invention like most of their doctrines. Julian the Apostate reproached the Catholics of his day with continually calling Mary, Mother of God. On this point the faith of the Catholic Church constantly teaches that in Christ the divine and human nature subsist by the same divine person, that Christ is truly God and truly man, and that the Virgin Mary is the mother of God by having brought forth him who is God, though he derived from her only his assumed nature of man. Her dignity is expressed by the evangelist when he says, *That of her was born Jesus, who is called the Christ*. From this text alone is the article of Catholic Faith sufficiently evinced, that she is truly the Mother of God; that is in the same sense with St. Paul when he says, that we are redeemed by the blood of a God.

It is likewise urged against us that expressions are to be found in some of our prayer-books which seem to ascribe more to the Mother of God, than can justly be given to a mere creature. To give an appearance of plausibility to this grave accusation, unconnected passages are culled out of some of our books of devotion, care being taken to suppress every passage which might elucidate their true meaning. We challenge those who make the charge to produce a single Catholic prayer-book in which, for one expression to which their squeamishness or their desire to depreciate the Mother of our Redeemer, can take exception, twenty may not be pointed out which incontestably prove that nothing but her powerful intercession is intended to be invoked of the Blessed Virgin Mary. It would be in the highest degree absurd to suppose that we pray

to her in one place as the giver of gifts, and in another as only the intercessor for them. It is obvious to common sense that one and the same person cannot possibly be both intercessor and bestower. This consideration ought to weigh with Protestants and induce them when they meet with an expression which, when taken by itself, might appear to them doubtful, to explain it in conjunction with many others in the same book, aye, most likely, in the very same page, the meaning of which can admit of no possible doubt. We never say to Christ *pray for us*, nor would we to his mother, if we believed her the source of grace and bestower of favours.

We may probably be referred to a French prayer-book in which it is said that the Blessed Virgin is solicited to command her son. We have never seen such an expression in any Catholic prayer-book; but, supposing such a passage to exist, it can only mean that she should urge her powerful interest with him. If more was meant by the author, he was no Catholic. It is nothing unusual however by a species of metonymy to employ the subordinate for the principal agent, and attribute to the intercessor what we know is the office of the Superior. Let us for example suppose a criminal under sentence of death who petitions the Queen Mother to obtain his pardon from her son, and begs of her 'to urge him, to entreat him, to command him as her son to pardon him.' We would at once ascribe, such language to the man's extreme earnestness, not to any idea on his part that the mother had authority over or was independent of the King; for if he thought so, he would directly ask her to pardon him without any reference to her son. Words are but arbitrary signs, and must be taken in the sense in which it is evident from the context they were used.

Those who find fault with the titles which we give the Blessed Virgin, in the metaphorical hymn called the Litany of Loretto, should remember that they are not of modern composition, and partake somewhat of the oriental style. It must however be a matter of perfect indifference by what number of titles we address her so long as our petition to her is invariably '*Pray for us.*' Moreover these titles have a mystical meaning. For instance, '*Seat of Wisdom,*' in whom the Wisdom of God was pleased to dwell for nine months, and replenish her with wisdom. '*Cause of our joy,*' by bringing forth the Saviour of the world who makes peace in heaven and on earth. '*Spiritual Vessel,*' enabled by the Holy Spirit to become the Mother of God and of course a Vessel of Honour selected by the pure bounty of God. '*Tower of Ivory,*' *Thy neck*, says the spouse, Cant. 7-4, is a *tower of Ivory*—on account of her spotless purity. And so on of the rest.

The psalter of the Blessed Virgin, as it is called, is falsely ascribed to St. Bonaventure, and unworthy to bear his name. It is not true that it has ever been approved by the Church, on the contrary it has been disapproved and if we mistake not may be found on the Index. (See Fabricius in Biblioth. Med. aetat. Bellarmin and Labbe de Script. Eccl. Nat. Alexander, Hist. Eccl. Sacc. 13.) It cannot but be satisfactory to Catholics to find that the enemies of their religion are continually under the necessity of misrepresenting it in order to render it assailable. It is this reflection which makes them view calumnies, misrepresentations and abuse with indifference, if not indeed with some degree of complacency; for they feel assured that such conduct will ultimately do more good than harm to the cause of truth. It is our province however to state our

genuine doctrine and authorized practices, not to defend the misrepresentations of the former or abuse of the latter, should any be found to exist.

The honor then, which we pay to the Mother of God, is solely on account of the honor and dignity which he has himself been graciously pleased to confer upon her, for ; of herself, she is nothing. So that in honouring her, we, in her, and through her honor, Christ himself. 'There is no question,' says the great St. Jerome, 'that whatever praise we give to the Mother, it all redounds to the Son.'

ON THE AUTHORITY OF HOLY WRIT IN MATTERS OF FAITH.

(Continued from No. III.)

We have hitherto shown what was the conduct of Jesus Christ and his Apostles, with reference to the faithful they instructed : we shall now consider that of their successors.

Immediately after the demise of the Apostles, Saints Clement and Polycarp, instructed by them, recommended the faithful to listen to *their pastors* : they never exhorted them to verify with the aid of the Bible whether the doctrines preached by them were true or false. St. Ignatius did the same in the 2d century : St. Irenæus in the same, bears testimony to the alacrity, with which Florin listened to the words of those who had heard the Apostles : he refuted heretics by tradition as well as by scripture ; he attested, as we hinted above, that several churches had conserved their faith by tradition, which did not possess a page of the Bible. In the 3rd, Tertullian refused to admit heretics to dispute with the aid of scripture. Here then are the Apostles' immediate successors notorious prevaricators in the eyes of Protestants !

But the latter furnish us with arms to wield against themselves. For the convenience of their system they have thought proper to suppose that the Holy Scripture was translated from the very commencement into the greater number of languages, and that those versions wonderfully contributed to the diffusion of the Gospel. This is a glorious imagination. The Jews no longer understood Hebrew ; and the Chaldaic paraphrases are not very correct. The Syrians comprehended it still less, and it is not precisely known to what epoch the Syriac version should be referred. The Apostles are said to have founded churches in Armenia, Persia, and even among the Parthians ; but there was no translation of the Bible in the languages of those nations in the first centuries. St. Paul had preached and established churches in Arabia ; but the Arabic version is of no great antiquity. St. Mark had founded that of Alexandria, but an Egyptian or Coptic version did not appear till late. Neither was any translation known of in any African or Punic tongue, none in ancient Spanish, none in the Celtic or ancient Britannic idiom. We are not acquainted with the date of the Latin or Italic vulgate : it was made after the Greek Septuagint, which was very defective, as it is to this version that Protestants attribute the majority of the errors, with which they charge the Fathers of antiquity.

They rejoin that Greek was every where understood. This is incorrect. It was understood by polished and educated persons, but not by the mass of the people ; otherwise the Apostles would not have needed the gift of tongues ; it would have sufficed for them to have known Greek ;

whereas in the Acts (ii., 9.) they are related to have spoken SIXTEEN different languages.

Another obstacle was the uncertainty as to which books of Scripture were authentic, and which apocryphal; which divine, and which—merely human. Le Clerc pretends that the canon of those books was framed by the Apostles themselves, before the death of St. John; Mosheim thinks that that took place in the second century, but Basnage maintains that for the first five or six centuries there was no canon universally received; that each Church had the liberty of enrolling in it any book it pleased; that in the 7th or 8th it was still a matter of doubt whether St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews, the Apocalypse, and several books of the Old Testament were or were not canonical. It matters us little to ascertain which of those authors be right: this would not have happened, says Basnage, if they had recognized an infallible tribunal, to which the decision of the question belonged.

This would still less have occurred, say we, if they had then believed, like the Protestants, that the reading of the Scriptures was absolutely necessary to establish the faith of Christians; but they were persuaded, like us, that it suffices to 'hear the Church.' (Matt. xviii. 17.) This critic's reflection proves more against the Protestants than against us.

But let us for a moment suppose, that the canon was framed in the beginning, and that the Scriptural versions were quite common, and widely diffused. What would we gain by such an hypothesis? At the time spoken of, there were not two persons in twenty that knew how to read; books were exceedingly rare; it required almost the life of a man to transcribe a complete copy of the Bible, and such a copy would have cost at least 400 rupees of Anglo-Indian currency. Before the Armenian Bible was printed, a manuscript copy sold for 600 rupees. 'What an obstacle to the reading of the holy books!' exclaims on this subject Beausobre; we agree, but this impediment has continued up to our own times in the Levant, and still prevails there: ignorance of the alphabet or at least of reading, universally reigns there; and should those Christians on that account be deprived of the word of God? Should we for that reason abstain from preaching to them Christianity? No, Protestants for their convenience always suppose, that knowledge was as common in the first two or three centuries, as it has been since the invention of printing, and they have accumulated fables and hypothesis to support their imaginative system.

2dly. It is impossible that very ancient books, written in dead, and to us foreign languages, composed by authors that had neither the same habits nor inclinations as we, intended for nations, that relished allegories and figurative style, could have been clear enough to fix our belief, and to act as our guides. This fact has been demonstrated not only by Catholic controversialists, but also by several Protestants, whose sentiments we quoted above. To give up the Sacred Scriptures to private judgment, and to the arbitrary interpretation of every reader, is this not attributing to them only an equal authority with ordinary books, and wishing as many religions as there are heads? In the end, it is not the letter of the text, that establishes our faith, but the sense that *we give* it. Consequently as this sense proceeds from ourselves, and not from God (unless each of us pretend to be *individually* assisted by the Holy Spirit) it is no longer God that teaches us; it is we ourselves that are *our own* guides.

3dly. As several dogmas taught in the holy books are mysteries, truths, namely, superior to human comprehension ; it is contrary to the nature of things to pretend, that reason should be the arbiter and judge in their regard. On what principle of natural enlightenment are we to judge of what God can or cannot do ? When it is supposed that God has not been able to reveal incomprehensible truths, it is the same as to imagine that he has been unable to manifest to the blind-born, the existence of light or colours.

4thly. If the Bible be the *sole* rule of faith, it is such for the ignorant as well as the wise, because faith is a duty exacted of all by God. But is an ignoramus, that knows not how to read, capable of consulting the original text of Scripture, and to satisfy himself of its authenticity and integrity, and of the fidelity of the version ? If he be content to hold those three points on the authority of the Church, *et quidem* of the Catholic Church, why should he not rely on her, regarding the meaning to be given to each passage ?

The *entêtement* of Protestants on this head is inconceivable. It is far easier, say they, to decide whether a dogma be or be not taught in Scripture, than to discuss all the proofs of the truth of the Christian religion : hence, (they continue) as the most ignorant are capable of the latter discussion, as otherwise their faith would be without foundation, a mere enthusiasm, they are, *a fortiori*, capable of the former.

Incorrect reasoning. A simple Christian is not necessitated to examine *all the proofs* that may be given of the truth of his religion ; *one* well understood is sufficient to found his faith on : such, for example, are the miracles of Jesus Christ, and of the Apostles ; these are facts that are evident to the most uneducated Christian. On the contrary to know whether such a dogma be taught in Scripture, he must be certain, first, that that Scripture is inspired by God : 2dly, that the book containing the dogma in question, is canonical and not apocryphal ; 3dly, that the passage under examination has not been interpolated, nor corrupted ; 4thly, that it has been faithfully translated ; 5thly, that he takes it in its true bearing, and that all who do otherwise are in error ; 6thly, that that meaning is not contradicted by any other passage in Scripture. When we quote Scripture to Protestants, they make all these objections to our interpretation : we are then justified in opposing them in the same manner. What simple Christian is capable of satisfying himself on all these difficulties ?

5thly. The Bible in place of determining the belief, and deciding the doubts of every individual, is on the contrary the subject of all discussions. Between Catholics and Protestants it is a continual matter of doubt, which is the true meaning of such and such passages : every sect pretends to understand them better than its rivals. Who is to decide the controversy ? If there be no means of deciding it, then Jesus Christ left his Testament, that it might be a bane of discord for his Church ! Whenever Protestants have found themselves grappled with Socinians, they always have had recourse to tradition, to prove that the latter were distorting the meaning of the Bible, and giving it interpretations till then unknown. Thus the Socinians were clearly rebutted with a rampart previously destroyed by the Protestants, but re-erected by them when their purpose was to be served.

(*To be continued.*)

THE RELIGIOUS CHAMELEONS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—You and some of your correspondents, have, I fear, placed the *different-religious-denomination-gentlemen* in no enviable position, by demanding a confession of their faith! A call, which I have reasons to think, will not be responded to with any degree of satisfaction; but, I trust, these *worthy reclaimers of Catholics* will see the necessity of making the required declaration with openness and candor, eschewing all equivocation! No Christian should be ashamed to avow his faith. Although the *Christian Advocate* has been drawing on its existence by abusing the Catholic Church for a period of three months, the Indian public has not yet had an opportunity of learning which sect of Protestants has the honor of claiming fraternity with the RELIGIOUS CHAMELEONS. I, for my part, would like to know, to what denominations of Protestants the conductors of the *Advocate* belong, as I sometimes make use of the *argumentum ad hominem*.

Curiosity is on the *qui vive*, and many are the conjectures as to the response of the *Advocate*. I have been quite bewildered in attempting to make a guess, and as a last resource consulted, also in vain, Dr. Southey's List of Sectaries (of the present day) which is very aptly termed 'a precise nomenclature.' Here are the sects, and from the pen of a Protestant too!

'Armenians, Socinians, Baxterians, Presbyterians, New-Americans, Sabellians, Lutherans, Unitarians, Millenarians, Necessarians, Sublapsarians, Supralapsarians, Muggletonians, Antinomians, Hutchinsonians, Sandimonians, Baptists, Anabaptists, Pædobaptists, Methodists, Universalists, Calvinists, Materialists, Destructionists, Brownists, Independents, Protestants, Hugonots, Non-Jurors, Seceders, Hernhutters, Dunkers, Jumpers, Shakers, and Quakers,' &c., &c. *All pure Scripture Christians!!!*

The conductors of the *Advocate* seem to cheer their Christian hearts in nicknaming us as *Papists* and *Romanists*. If by these terms they mean only to imply that Catholics belong to the Holy Roman Catholic Church, we glory in them,—but since *The Religious Chameleons* have already so often wilfully perverted and unblushingly misrepresented our faith, they can have no objection, in their turn, to be nicknamed the PERVERTERS OF THE TRUE CHURCH OF CHRIST!!

24th July, 1839.

NO BIGOT.

PROTESTANT CREED.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—There is a paragraph of *belief*, given by a correspondent of the *Christian Advocate* signing himself 'Servitus,' which I expected would have been noticed by you in your last issue; but as it seems that either it has escaped your observation, or other more pressing matters have prevented your advertng to it,—I would solicit your permission to bring it thus prominently forward to show how far this portion of the Protestant creed, comprising as it does the FAITH of the 'different denominations of Protestants,' is consistent with the religious feeling of every Christian and the principle it involves, sanctioned, as it is attempted to be proved, by the scriptures themselves—the only rule of Protestant faith.

To explain away the question respecting the Church to which Christ promised, that he shall remain with her for ever, and that the gates of hell

shall not prevail against her, Servitus asserts—(it may be as well to give the whole paragraph, to show the depth and the force, and the lucidity of the explanation which beautifully comprehends the different branches of theological disquisition.) ‘We (i. e., the Protestants of different denominations) believe within the pale of that communion (the Roman Catholic) there are good men notwithstanding the anti-scriptural nature of the whole system; and so we believe, that there are good men in every system (who would be good, yea, BETTER WITHOUT ANY SYSTEM AT ALL) of whom the Church, which shall never be moved, is composed.’

According to this doctrine, the declaration of Christ refers to no system whatever; and as to his Church, Christ wills that it shall be composed of the *good* (morally good I believe) of every denomination of religionists in the world, and of the *good* also among those whose belief goes no further than that they have accidentally sprung from nature—to eat, drink, and be merry withal, while such tendency in their life lasts them. And as our Lord is, by implication, quite indifferent to any system or religion you may profess, he requires of you to be *good* only, that you may be directly drawn into the bosom of his Church and live in the joyous hope of eternal felicity.—Whether therefore you be an Atheist or a Deist, a Free-thinker or an Independent,—whether you be a Baptist, a Calvinist, or a Lutheran, it matters not,—for these and all the other off-sets of Protestantism, having only morality for their badge, do admirably and very constantly compose *the* Church; nay, this is not all,—you are told to take a further step. If you have any system of your own, you are advised forthwith to eschew it—to cast it away as an incubus that will either hinder your obtaining, or in some measure prove a drawback to your salvation; for, it is a fact, deduced from this admirable doctrine of the ‘Protestants of different denominations,’ that you are *more* acceptable to God when you have no religion at all, than when you have any. You should, accordingly, have no faith on aught that appertains to your eternal welfare, your only solicitude is to be morally good; and to be careful besides, that in this your anxiety, you draw not from the springs of the various systems which are insidiously or openly presented to you to partake of, for then verily the chance of salvation is against you. Goodness, and that simply according to your own notion of that virtue, should be your sole guide to heaven; the only aim and starting post to the securing to yourself a membership of the Church of Christ in this vale of tears, and distracting systems!

It must be admitted, that in the above, I have rather extenuated than set down aught in malice, and that the conclusion come to has been correctly and fairly deduced from the *belief* of the Protestants themselves, furnished to us by one of their own members. The *Christian Advocate* will not dare to deny that such is his creed; and, if he do, then must he repudiate the wisdom of his correspondent, and throw this Protestant Daniel with all his arguments over-board. Servitus may, with some justice complain of the result of his labour and assistance and exclaim with Falstaff, ‘call you this, backing of your friends? a plague upon such backing!’ but then, the retort courteous would be, and with some justice too, a more felicitous exclamation of Falstaff’s ‘an you have not forgotten what the inside of a Church is made of, I am a peppercorn, a brewer’s horse, The inside of a church! Company, villanous company, hath been the spoil of you.’

THE TRIUMPH OF TRUTH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—Some one under the signature of *A Protestant Layman* has thought proper to bestow on my brief communication a notice of no less than two and a half columns of *The Calcutta Christian Advocate*, in the course of which he fully admits, what I have stated as being admitted by most Protestants, that a good Catholic can obtain Salvation. His words are the following :—

‘In conceding the point that *it is not impossible for a Catholic to obtain salvation*, a Protestant does not mean that he will be saved simply on the ground of his belief in the truths of Catholicism distinct from the doctrines and precepts of Christianity; but rather, notwithstanding his errors, on account of his faith in the truths revealed in the Gospel. He may hope to be saved, not because he believes in the ‘infallibility of his church,’ in the efficacy of ‘penances’ and ‘indulgences,’ or other Popish doctrines; but because in conjunction with them, he believes, also, in the doctrines of Christianity, in the Saviour of the world; in the influences of the Holy Spirit to regenerate and sanctify the soul; in the necessity of the atonement; in the remission of sins by the blood of Christ; *in short, in all the truths, precepts, and doctrines of the Gospel.*’

Now, if according to this champion of Protestantism a Catholic can obtain salvation, what need is there of further controversy? Is not salvation all that a man can wish for? This is precisely the ground on which I have taken my position, and although *A Protestant Layman* sets out by saying that I have exulted before gaining a victory, his admissions quoted above, not only prove that he has left my position unshaken, but also that truth has triumphed over error and delusion. Truly has the Evangelist said, ‘Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee—thou wicked servant’ !!!

But as if not content by admitting that a Catholic can be saved, he goes on to inform us, that when he asked Catholics, whether a Protestant could be saved, he could not get them to make the admission. If my position, based as it is on the reiterated admissions of the opposite party, needed any collateral support, the above gratuitous information supplies it; for there we are told by *A Protestant Layman*, on the one hand, that Protestants admit that Catholics can be saved; and, on the other, that Catholics do *not* admit that Protestants can be saved: or, in other words, that *both* parties admit the safety of the Catholic road, whilst the safety of the Protestant road is denied by *one** of those parties. I here leave the unbiassed and unsophisticated child of reason to make his election.

Having met my opponent so far as my position was concerned, I should have concluded here; but I felt that I would deprive your readers of the choicest *morçeau* in *A Protestant Layman's* epistle, were I not to beg of you the favor of laying before them the following few queries which I have selected from it, on account of the good sense, wisdom and research, which they display :—

1st. ‘Is the shaving of the crown of a Priest’s head, in the shape of a ring, and not in the form of a cross, required by the New Testament?’

2nd. ‘Are half-boiled eggs prohibited in the New Testament to be eaten during lent; or sanctioned to be eaten at such a season only on payment of money?’

* Certainly by far the most numerous !

3rd. 'Is the ringing of a bell during mass necessary, and authorized in the Scriptures?'

As I believe that a Priest with shaved head can be saved, that we may go to heaven without eating half-boiled eggs in lent, and that notwithstanding the ringing of bells our orisons will be heard, I shall not go out of my way to answer these sapient queries, but leave them to be dealt with by others as they deserve.

23d July, 1839.

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Selections.

THE ALLIANCE BETWEEN POPERY AND HEATHENISM.

Letter II. Continued.—Dr. Wiseman to Mr. Poynder.

A similar objection has been made, even in more ancient times; for Tertulian and other writers of the first ages go so far as to suppose that it was a policy of the arch-deceiver to pre-occupy or copy the sacraments and rites of the new and old covenants in heathenish religions, that so he might lead men astray. I am not discussing the correctness of this idea; I only want the fact of their acknowledging such resemblances between true and false religions.*

But, Sir, has it never occurred to you how this argument of yours may be turned against doctrines as well as rites? and indeed your reasoning is of this sort; and not only against Catholic doctrines, but against the entire Christian faith. Nay, are you not aware that this very line of argument has been pursued by the enemies of Christianity? Is not the doctrine of the Trinity clearly to be traced in the celebrated letter of Plato to Dionysius given by Eusebius, and in the works of Plotinus and others of his school, and in the Oupnekhat and the Vedas; and in the philosophical writings of Lao-Tseu? And has not Dupuis, in his *Origine de tous les Cultes*, deduced therefrom, that this dogma could not have been revealed in Christianity, since it was so well known before, and so widely diffused; but that it was borrowed, by St. John, and the other apostles, from the heathenish philosophy? Are not the very terms of the doctrine, the *Word* as well as the Father and Spirit, and their procession one from another, found by him and others in this eastern school? Has not Volney drawn a parallel between Christ and the Indian Chrishna, in name and character? And are not the parallels between the two much stronger than any you have brought between our ceremonies and those of ancient Rome or India? Has not the idea of a divine incarnation, and of salvation through the interference of God in the flesh, been found again and again in the Indian mythology, and in that of other eastern religions? Could we not easily collect in the same quarters many resemblances to the doctrines of justification, of predestination, of grace, and of atonement? And yet, who that has an understanding to judge, is driven for a moment from the holdings of faith by such comparisons as these? Doubtless in this country the experiment has not been made as it has abroad. The *Ruines* of Volney and the abridgment of Dupuis' *Origine* have done much towards sapping religion, among the weak in France; and a popular work such as you have put forth, might be easily got up in English, attacking Christian truths precisely in the same manner. And perhaps those who have any desire to find the evidences of

* 'Ceterum si Numæ Pompilii superstitiones revolvamus, si sacerdotalia officia, insignia et privilegia, si sacrificalia ministeria, et instrumenta, et vasa ipsorum sacrificiorum, ac piaculorum, ac votorum curiositates consideremus, nonne manifeste diabolus morositatem illam Judicæ legis imitatus?' *De Præscript.* cap. xl.—'Quo agnito hic quoque studium diaboli cognoscimus, res Dei æmulantis; qui ex ipso baptismo exerceat in suis quid simile.' *De Bapt.* cap. v.

Christianity wanting in the balance, would be satisfied by such an argument. And so it is with your work : to those who have already made up their minds that popery is idolatry, your arguments will be most convincing, for there will be an interior echo to respond to its invective ; but on the Catholic or on the enlightened Protestant, it can have no more influence than the similar argument of the French infidel.

I have already intimated, that the few rites preserved, in the Protestant religion, might be just as easily traced to heathen customs. In what does the sermon which forms the main feature of your service differ from the *chutbat* or discourse of the Imam in the Mohammedan mosque ? and the pulpit from its *mimbar* ? Indeed, to tell the truth, I rather suspect it may be still more heathenish ; for, if I remember right, in the basilica at Pompeii, (from which class of buildings the form of three-aisled churches is taken) there is a sort of elevated pulpit or reading desk, occupying the most important place. Not to say that in the lately excavated temple of Concord, wherein Cicero harangued, there seems to be something very much of the same nature. Why, is not your surplice and cassock the exact copy or rather successor of the upper garment over a longer one, which Mr. Blunt tells us was worn by the ancient priests, as exhibited in a bronze of the museum at Naples ? Nay, he is obliged to own, that 'the cassock of the Protestant Church is an imitation of this more ancient article of clerical dress,' that is, I suppose, of the Catholic cassock which he has just been deriving from the heathen one.* And moreover your surplice must always be white, the colour ever used in ancient heathen worship, whereas we vary ours according to circumstances. Again, he tells us that the custom of boys such as sing in cathedrals attending at worship 'is a custom manifestly derived from heathen times.' And he quotes a picture from Herculaneum, where a boy attends at sacrifice dressed in a white tunic, descending to his knees, and he adds that the boy who ministers at the altar in Italy has the same dress and office, only that he supplies books instead of chaplets.† Now, as the Italian surplice does not reach below the waist, I hold that the parallel of boys in white tunics with books will be more easily found in St. Paul's than in St. Peter's.

What is your marriage ceremony but the counterpart of that of the Roman pagans : for they too used a ring on such occasions, the *anulum pronubum*, as Tertullian calls it ; so that Juvenal says,—

Conventum tamen, et pactum et sponsalia nostra
Tempestate paras, jamque a tonsore magistro
Pectoris, et digito pignus fortasse dedisti.

SAT. VI.

For which use of ceremony and outward rite, I know not what warrant you find in the New Testament. And in like manner the endowing with all worldly goods corresponds to the formula 'Ubi tu Cajus ago Caja,' though where the worshipping with the body, 'and with my body I thee worship,' came from I cannot discover ; for, as when Catholics speak of the worship of images, it is insisted, in spite of their declarations, that they adore them, I suppose I must take this bodily worship for idolatry, and that of the very worst kind, being directed towards a living being.

The funeral service may be treated in like manner ; the fashion of bearing the body to the grave with great pomp, but without a single symbol about it, of Christian hope, or of religious feeling, appears to all foreigners marvelously heathenish ; and the friends going as mourners, and the escutcheons of the family borne with it, and the hired mutes, are exactly to be found in the ancient Roman funerals ; where the bier was followed by relations, and the images of ancestors were borne before it, and many hired mourners swelled

* Vestiges of ancient customs, p. 112.

† The upper garment worn by the priests is called, according to Mr. Blunt, the *moz-zetta*. The *mozetta* is only worn by bishops, and in Rome only by cardinals, and is only a tipnet which covers the shoulders. Never yet have I found a Protestant traveller describe any thing relating to our service correctly.

the crowd. In Italy, on the contrary, the clergy and charitable confraternities alone accompany the body, singing religious chaunts. Then, the custom of nearest relations throwing earth on the coffin corresponds, as well as possible, with their lighting the funeral pile in ancient times; and I think too that this practice shows a better connexion between ancient and modern rites, than your charming conjecture, which you recommend to the notice of the learned, that the '*Terra sit tibi levis*' (which for prosody's sake is, on monuments, always *sit tibi terra levis*) 'was the foundation of prayers for the dead;' (p. 80) which conjecture I suppose you mean to confirm in the very following paragraph, by allowing that the Jews at the time of the Maccabees offered sacrifice for the dead.

Of your baptism I need not speak; for assuredly your quotation from Ovid deriding the absurdity of thinking that sin can be washed away by water, would apply, in the mouth of a free-thinker, quite as well to baptism as to holy water; or rather better, as we do not believe crimes to be forgiven by this.

Thus you see that with very little trouble, we may trace as many resemblances between Protestantism and heathenism, as you can between Catholic and pagan worship. For, with a little second-hand quotation and a good deal of original invention, I might have extended each of these heads into so many chapters, and made as long a book as you have. And if my heads would not have been as numerous as yours, my argument would have been better, because I should have touched on *all* the ceremonies which you have preserved.

And then too I could have made another charge. How come you to have retained so many remnants of popish idolatry, saints in your calendar, and saints to whom your churches are dedicated? And if heathenish deification and Catholic canonization are the same thing, what make you of the apotheosis of King Charles, martyr? For what virtue was he taken into the calendar? To what cause did he bear witness? For I have myself seen his letter to the pope wherein he intimates his readiness to barter the Protestant religion in England for temporal assistance from the holy see. How comes it that as yet, in the Temple church is preserved the inscription which grants an indulgence to all who visit it annually? * Surely, if popery be idolatry, you have continued many of its abominations.

DECLARATION OF THE CATHOLIC BISHOPS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

(Continued from No. 3, page 44.)

SECTION V.

On the power of forgiving sins and the precept of confession.

The Catholic Church is charged with impiety, in usurping the power of forgiving sins, and with spiritual tyranny, in imposing on the people the yoke of confession.

The Catholic Church cannot be charged with impiety, for exercising powers given by Christ to his Apostles and to their lawful successors; nor with tyranny, in enforcing the observance of the precept of Christ.

Catholics believe that Christ granted to his Apostles, and to the Priests of his Church, power to forgive sins, by the administration of the sacraments of baptism, and penance, to those who are duly disposed to receive this grace. They believe that the sacrament of penance is an institution of Christ, no less than the sacrament of baptism. The belief of both rests on the same foundation.

* This curious document, placed over the front door, on the inside, runs as follows:

ANNO AB INCARNATIONE DOMINI MCLXXXV DEDICATA
HÆC ECCLESIA IN HONORE BEATÆ MARIAE A DNO
ERACLIO DEI GRA SCE (SANCTÆ) RESURRECTIONIS ECCLESIAE
PATRIARCHA IIII IDUS FEBRUARI QI EÅ (QUIEAM) ANNATIM
PETETIBUS DEUVNTASI (INJUNCTA SIBI) PENE ET IÀ LX DIES INDULTS:

In both these sacraments, sin is forgiven by the ministry of man. *Be baptized every one of you, for the remission of sins*, Acts ii. 38; *whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven*, John, xx. 23. But no actual sin can be forgiven at the mere will of any Pope, or any Priest, or any person whomsoever, without a sincere sorrow for having offended God, and firm resolution to avoid future guilt, and atone for past transgressions. Any person who receives absolution without these necessary dispositions, far from obtaining the remission of his sins, incurs the additional guilt of hypocrisy and profanation.

The obligation of sacramental confession to a priest is not an imposition of the Church, but a precept of Christ. Without the voluntary confession of the penitent, the power of forgiving, or retaining sins, could not be exercised, with discretion and judgment, by the minister of the sacrament of penance. The confession of sins could never have been introduced, had it not been received from the beginning as a divine ordinance for the remission of sin. It has been practised from the earliest ages of Christianity. It has been attended with the most salutary effects. Besides being a means of obtaining the remission of sin, it affords relief to the troubled conscience, and opportunities of reclaiming deluded sinners from mischievous projects, and causing reparation to be made for injuries done to persons, property, or character. It may be ridiculed by such as *blaspheme those things which they know not* (2 Pet. ii. 12), but will be ever cherished as a merciful and salutary institution, by those who are sincerely sorry for their sins, and earnestly sue for pardon.

INSUFFICIENCY OF PROTESTANTISM IN A DYING HOUR.

The celebrated Molines, to whom the Protestants, on account of his eloquence, gave the name of the Protestant Fletcher, asked one day, a Catholic priest, whether among the dying, whom he assisted, there were any who entertained doubts or uneasiness respecting the truth of religion? No, answered the priest, they regret only that they have not always lived up to its injunctions. As for the religion itself, I never met with any who had the smallest doubt about it. Well, replied Molines, I have not found that such is the case among us. Among the dying, many have often asked me, Sir, are we right in our religion? Yes, yes, I said always to them, be easy and undisturbed on that point. But, alas! Sir, he added, I gave, or endeavoured to give them a conviction, in those trying moments, which I did not feel myself. Molines himself became afterwards a Catholic. The circumstances of feeling a want of conviction, like Molines, is, I am convinced, not uncommon among the well instructed members of the Protestant Church. Would that like him too, they would labour to remove it!

It was the opinion of Dr. Johnson, that the conversion of a Catholic to the Protestant religion could not be sincere and lasting, while he thought, equally that the conversion of a Protestant to the Catholic religion would have both the qualities of sincerity and durability. This opinion is mentioned by Boswell, with his own glossary upon it. Sir Walter Scott, says Boswell, informs me, that he heard Johnson say, 'A man who is converted from Protestantism to Popery may be sincere; he parts with nothing, he is only superadding to what he had already. But a convert from Popery to Protestantism gives up so much of what he has held as sacred as any thing that he retains; there is so much laceration of mind in such a conversion, that it can hardly be sincere and lasting.' 'The truth of this observation,' adds Boswell, 'may be confirmed by many and eminent instances, some of which will occur to most of my readers.'

INTELLIGENCE.

IRELAND.—CONSECRATION OF KILMILAN MONASTERY. On Thursday the 30th of August 1838, this monastery was consecrated by his grace the Roman Catholic Archbishop. The foundation stone was laid by M. J. Blacke, Esq., M.P. who is the principal benefactor to this laudable establishment.

The most Rev. Dr. Murray, R. C. Archbishop of Dublin, the most Rev. Dr. Crolly, R. C. Archbishop of Armagh, the most Rev. Dr. Slattery, R. C. Archbishop of Cashel, and the most Rev. Dr. M'Halle, R. C. Archbishop of Tuam, together with the four trustees of the college of Maynooth, viz. Lord Fingal, Lord French, Sir Patrick Bellew, and Mr. Hussey, had an interview on Monday with his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, at the Vice-regal Lodge, for the purpose of soliciting an increase of the grant to Maynooth college, and also for the extension of similar grants to provincial establishments for ecclesiastical education. We understand that the deputation met with a most gracious reception from his Excellency; and the probability of obtaining from a liberal government a request so reasonable, and so strongly recommended by the desires of the people, might be said to amount to a certainty.—*Weekly Register*.

We are glad to be enabled to inform the Catholic public that a splendid church is fast progressing in the town of Maynooth, a locality so well known and so much appreciated on account of the Roman Catholic college there established for the education of the Catholic clergy of Ireland.

FLOWERS FROM THE HOLY FATHERS. No. II.

(From the Catholic Magazine, for April 1838.)

‘ In fructu, non in foliis et ramis, pœnitentia cognoscenda est.—*Sti. Gregorii magni. in 2 Reg. cap. 2.*

With heart and eye prepared to weep,
Sorrow sincere, contrition deep,
Confession serious and complete—
Such are the wants for Penance meet;
But more than all a purpose sure,
To sin no more for love or lure.

Though at confession's chair we bow,
With tearful eye and humbled brow;
'Tis mockery and idle pain
If we rise up to sin again.
Albeit the bud be red and fair,
A worm is lurking meanwhile there.

What though we tell with moistened cheek,
With quivering lip, and action meek,
A beadroll dark of many a sin,
'Gainst God and man, without, within;
Our tears are lost, our penance vain,
If we go home to sin again.

With firm resolve and purpose set,
May memory keep our eyelids wet;
These blossoms ripen into fruit,
By Virtue's growth and Love's pursuit;
And Grace infused co-operate
To make the goodly increase great.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor, care of Messrs. W. Rushton and Co.

Printed by Messrs. W. Rushton and Co., for the Proprietors. Price one rupee per month, or ten rupees per annum in advance.

THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

' One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.'

No. V.

AUGUST 3, 1839.

VOL. I.

In our second number we set forth and established the evident proposition that there can be but one true revealed religion or one true Church, because there is but *one God, one Faith, one Baptism*; and, because, we must all form *one body*, animated with *one spirit*. This religion, revealed by Jesus Christ, is one entire compact system of divine truth, in which no point, however unimportant it may seem, can clash with another. If any church teaches a doctrine, which is opposed to any article of this divine system of truth, it is not the Church of Jesus Christ, because therein it not only does not hold his doctrine, but even denies what he has revealed. When two churches contradict each other in any single article,—when one asserts a doctrine which the other flatly denies, they cannot both be the True Church of Christ, because one in that point is essentially false, whilst the other therein is essentially true. As therefore the Catholic Church is, in many points, diametrically opposed to the Protestant Church, it is as evident as the plainest demonstration of Euclid, that one or the other of them is not the True Church of Christ. Moreover, the sects of the Protestant Church equally contradict each other in the points which led to their mutual separation. For there is not one which does not affirm something as true, which another does not deny as false. Amongst them, therefore, there is but one sect which can possibly be true; and as they are all in some points directly opposed to the Catholic Church, they all, if she is Christ's true Church, are from first to last false.

Urged by these irrefragable reasons and confident in the strength of her cause, the Catholic Church boldly declares, what Christ's Church can always do, that if in any one single article of her faith, either in the real presence, or in confession, or in purgatory, or in the honour paid by her to Saints, &c. &c.—she teaches a doctrine contrary to the doctrine revealed by Christ, she has no claim or title whatever to the high dignity of being his spotless Church; for to be such, her whole doctrine must be true, or the same exactly as that which our Saviour delivered to his Apostles. Now, without going to much length to prove that the Roman Catholic Church is Christ's Church, it is a very great point in her favour, that she is that illustrious society, which was founded by the Apostles; which received from them and long preserved (as all admit) the sacred deposit of faith;

K

which during the first three centuries, and since at different periods, sealed its sound doctrine with the blood of a host of martyrs; which, for 1800 years, has baffled the efforts of heresy and the powers of hell; which has seen at its head an unbroken line of Pontiffs from St. Peter down to the present Pope Gregory XVI.; which has converted to the faith every Christian nation in the world; which one in its faith and government, holy in its doctrine and Saints, Catholic in time, place, and name, Apostolical in its founders, bears the four grand marks which ought to characterize the Church of Christ. She is the ancient church and before every other. Others have gone out of her, but she has gone out of none. She traces her descent in direct lineage up to Jesus Christ. There can be no doubt, (for all agree to the fact,) that for the first four centuries she was the True Church; and since both in principle and practice she rejects every kind of change in *matters of Faith*, since no one can point out either the time when, or the place where, or the persons by whom any change or novelty in faith was admitted, it is very clear that, being true at first, she must unchanged be the same True Church still. Here then lies the point. Either the Catholic or the Protestant Church is in the wrong; for they contradict each other on several important heads. If the former be wrong in *any one single* article of her doctrine, she owns that she is *not* the True Church of Christ. If the latter be wrong, neither can it surely be the True Church. Which then of the two is not the True Church of Christ? Whether the Catholic be or be not, we need not here stop to enquire; the brief reasons above stated plead strongly in her favour without the aid of the written and unwritten word of God: But as for the Protestant Church, the question is at once settled. Taken in the whole, it has as many errors as it embraces contradictory and jarring sects. There can be at most but one sect true? Yet is there one? We know, that any church, that varies, either is or has been in error. We know that a church, by its very nature fallible, may any day teach falsehood. Is there then even one of the Protestant sects which is or can be the true Church of Christ? No! decidedly, No! For the *Christian Advocate* acknowledges that every Protestant sect has deviated from the truth, 'We see a departure in every system which owes its origin to man. The best form of Protestantism has its imperfections. We set not up any form of Protestantism as a perfect example, nor do we take any man as our leader or guide.' It is then certain that no sect of Protestantism, much less Protestantism itself which is a medley of errors, is or can be the true Church of Jesus Christ. Now the *Christian Advocate*, in terms less logical and correct than ours, asserts that God cannot reveal contradictory doctrines, that the system of Popery (as he terms the Catholic Religion) and the Protestant Church are opposed to each other, and that if one be scriptural and true, the other must be an error and a lie. But according to him (and he here speaks the truth,) Protestantism is at least in some points an error and a lie: we presume therefore that he admits the Catholic Church to be scriptural and true.

SCRIPTURE ALONE NOT A SUFFICIENT RULE OF FAITH.

Whenever we discuss any point of religious difference with our Protestant brethren they invariably argue as if we were bound to admit Scripture as interpreted by private judgment to be the sole rule of Christian

faith. But we hold that the written and unwritten word taken together constitute the true rule of faith. To expect us therefore to forego the testimony of either is no less unreasonable than to expect a man, engaged in an important law suit, to allow his case to go to trial upon half his evidence. Hence it is obvious, that the first point to be settled in any controversy between us and Protestant, is, which of these two rules of faith is the true one ; and there is no point in the controversy which involves greater interests as or demands more dispassionate inquiry.

We purpose to lay before our readers some of the grounds on which we rest our belief, that the written word alone is not the true rule of faith, and in doing so, we shall make free use of what has been already written on the subject. We revere both scripture and tradition, because both emanate from the same divine source. But we know, and experience has fully proved, that the written word is of itself a dead letter, unable to explain its own meaning ; that it may be, and has been made to speak any language which suits the caprice, inclination, or convenience of the readers ; that it has been profanely wrested by innovators and fanatics to support doctrines the most impious and contradictory.

We maintain that if our Saviour had intended the New Testament to be our sole rule of Christian faith, he would have either written it himself or have commanded his Apostles to do so ; whereas, he wrote no part of it nor does there appear, in his commission to the Apostles, any injunction to *write* the gospel ; but we find that they were repeatedly and emphatically commanded to *preach* it. Thus we have a commission expressly given to the Apostles to *preach* and *teach*, but it does not appear that they ever received any command to *write*. We find that the Apostles when instructing their intended successors in the ministry, when they point out the means by which the knowledge of Christianity is to be perpetuated, are still silent on this only rule of faith ; they talk not of Bible societies nor of Bible distributors, they appear to know of no other vehicle than oral tradition. ‘ *Hold fast,*’ says St. Paul to his disciple Timothy, ‘ *the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me—And the things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also,*’ (2 Tim. i. 13, ii. 2.) No mention is any where made by Christ to his Apostles or by them to their successors of any written rule of faith ; an omission which would be perfectly inexplicable on the supposition, that such a rule was intended for the guidance of Christians.

If it had been the intention of the Apostles to leave us a written code of Christian doctrine, it can hardly be doubted that they would have drawn it up in concert with an express declaration, that all things which our Saviour had taught were contained therein, and that it was henceforward to be the sole rule of faith. But of this there is no hint ; and the entire silence of scripture itself, on a point of such vital importance, is fatal to the Protestant principle ; unless, indeed, we can persuade ourselves that the spirit of God, would have left us a book to be the only rule of our belief, and yet have omitted to inform us of the circumstance. Or that the inspired writers should have compiled such a code of doctrine without once intimating to their disciples, the important use for which they intended it. Had they said : ‘ You have hitherto been guided by oral instruction from us ; but we have now composed this book ; it contains the whole of our doctrine, and we bequeath it to you to be the only rule of

your faith after our departure.' Had they said this, or any thing like this, the matter would have been clear. But does the New Testament itself profess to be any such record? It neither asserts it nor exhibits the most distant appearance of it.

In the New Testament we have four accounts of the life and death of our blessed Lord, the history of the events which followed his ascension, and a series of letters written to different persons upon different occasions; and not upon such subjects, be it observed, as we might naturally expect in a code of religious doctrine; but upon such as the passing events at the day offered to the writers. One of St. Paul's disciples had been left at Crete to regulate the infant Church of that island: the Apostle gives him directions for his conduct. A fugitive slave had received baptism: St. Paul sends him back to his master with a letter soliciting his pardon, St. John had heard of the hospitality of Gaius: he writes to him a congratulatory epistle. False teachers had endeavoured to seduce the converts: St. Jude warns them of their danger, and exhorts them to persevere in the doctrine which they had originally received. The same may be said of all the other epistles: they were occasional tracts called for by accidental circumstances. All these writings however, claim our veneration, and deserve our frequent and attentive perusal. They are authentic records of the actions of Christ, and of the sentiments of his Apostles on several interesting and important subjects. But what evidence is there that any of them separately, or that the whole collection together, contains all things whatsoever our Saviour commanded the Apostles, and which he commissioned them to teach to their disciples, would not, we repeat the Holy Spirit, had the scripture been designed to be the only rule of our faith, have in some part of them informed us, in plain and intelligible words, what are the essential articles of the Christian belief? Would not the scriptures have assumed a very different appearance from that which they now exhibit? Would they not, like the different codes of doctrine published by the reformed churches, have presented to the reader a full, clear and succinct statement of the faith and practice required from those for whose use they were written? But as they are, they do quite the reverse. It is in vain that you look into them for such statement: the articles of doctrine are scattered here and there without any attention to order: their meaning is frequently hidden under the obscurity of the language: the advance of the sincere enquirer is repeatedly arrested by apparent contradictions: and, it seldom happens, that any two readers after a patient and impartial investigation, agree in the same decision. To us it appears, that of all the possible forms under which a rule of faith could have been published to mankind, the New Testament is, as such, the most incongruous and confused. It is what no sensible man would have adopted: and, certainly, we ought not to attribute to the wisdom of God, that which we judge unworthy of the judgment of man. Far be it from us to speak disrespectfully of the sacred writings. We revere each book, individually, as the word of God. It is when we consider them as forming a complete record of Christian doctrine, the sole rule of Christian faith in the reformed hypothesis, that we presume to think them, as such, defective; because that hypothesis appears to us to degrade them below works that are confessedly of human origin, below the articles of the Church of England, and the numerous systems of belief with which the reformation has enlightened and perplexed mankind.

To build one's faith on the scripture alone, with security to his own conscience, it is not sufficient that he *suppose*, he must *prove* that it was intended by the Spirit of God to be his only guide. Now this is impossible. The intentions of the Almighty can be known to us through no other medium than revelation ; and, on this subject, revelation is silent.

Protestants cannot deny that tradition, or the unwritten word, was the original rule of Christianity ; it is therefore incumbent on them to demonstrate, and this by no less authority than that which established the rule, that it was at any time abrogated. Upon this point the whole controversy respecting tradition turns. If our separated brethren cannot clearly *prove* that the authority which tradition originally possessed *was cancelled, by the same power that established it*, then is it evident that their rule of faith rests on no better foundation than mere conjecture.

Granting, for the sake of argument, that the authority of tradition has been abrogated, the difficulties of the Protestant rule are thereby increased rather than diminished. They maintain, as *we know* truly, that the New Testament is the word of God. But how, we would ask, do *they* know it to be the word of God ? This they have to prove. Folly itself will not adduce the Testament to prove its own existence as the word of God. Will they say that its own internal evidence places it beyond the reach of doubt ? If so, how does it happen that different denominations disagree with each other as to which books are canonical, and which are Apocryphal : or in other words which are and which are not the word of God ? Let the Old and New Testament be put into the hands of any one who has never heard of revelation or of Christianity, and see if their internal evidence will convince him that they are the word of God. How does he know that the gospels were written by the Evangelists whose names are affixed to them ? If written by the Evangelists where does he learn that they were inspired ? The scriptures no where say so, and the titles were affixed by the Catholic Church, not by the Evangelists. This made the great St. Augustine say, ' I should not believe the gospel were I not moved thereunto by the authority of the Catholic Church.'

We would also ask if the whole of the Old and New Testament or only a part of them be the rule of faith. If the whole, then indeed must the Protestant be in an awkward dilemma, for many books of both Old and New Testament have been lost. Let those who have any doubt on the subject, consult the following texts :—Num. xxi, 14.—*It is not said in the book of the words of the Lord.* Where is this book ? Joshua x. 13.—*Is not this written in the book of Joshar.* Where is the book of Joshar ? I. Samuel x. 25.—*Then Samuel told the people the manner of the kingdom, and wrote it in a book and laid it up before the Lord.* This is lost. I. Chron. xxix. 29.—*The acts of David first and both are written in the book of Samuel the Seer, and the book of Nathan the prophet and the book of Gad the Seer.* Where are the books of these two prophets ? It is the opinion of the learned that St. Paul wrote three epistles to the Corinthians, and that the first is lost. For in that which we call the first Cor. v. 9.—St. Paul says, *I wrote you an epistle*, where is this epistle which he wrote to them ? Again St. Paul commands the epistle from Laodicea to be read in the Church. Caloss. iv. 16.—*And that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea.* Is not this also lost ? What is now become of the Protestant, rule of faith ? But perhaps, only a part of

the ' Old and New Testament form the rule of faith. Then we may be allowed to ask what part? and who is appointed to determine the part? Upon whomsoever the arduous task devolves let him be careful not to choose a book that has been lost. Again, how does the Protestant know, but the doctrines which are handed down by tradition, were contained in the books that have perished? If they were—and he can have no evidence to the contrary—in rejecting tradition, he rejects the *once written* word of God. These are the appalling difficulties, which, at every step, must obstruct the path of the man, who will admit scripture *alone* as the rule of his faith. Either he must reject the sacred scripture or admit tradition. These difficulties can be removed—these questions answered only by the voice of Catholic tradition. Set aside tradition and Christianity falls to ruin.

Of what use could the Bible, as a rule of faith, be to the great majority of Christianity before the invention of the art of printing, when probably not one out of twenty was able to read, and when a manuscript of such bulk as the Old and New Testament must have cost a sum which a primitive Christian cannot readily be supposed to be capable of procuring at a period when his poverty was a literal phrase? Can we persuade ourselves that the God of Goodness would have commanded us to believe all that he had revealed under pain of condemnation, and yet have left no means of arriving at an adequate knowledge of his truths, but a book which few could read and still fewer obtain? What an obstacle, exclaims the learned Protestant Beausobre, to the knowledge of the holy books. In the middle of the second century St. Irenæus writes, that among many barbarous people the purity of faith flourished, although they possessed neither ink nor paper.

What security has the Protestant reader that the book put into his hand is the true word of God? Is he to rely on the assertion in the title page or on the word of the Secretary of the Bible Society? It is evidently a translation. But who were the translators? Were they equal to the task? Honest in the execution of it? Unprejudiced in their judgment? Of all this he knows nothing: and yet, till he is satisfied on these heads, he may, for aught he can shew to the contrary, be reading the conjectures of men for the word of God, and reverencing the errors of the translators as the dictates of eternal truth.

In different manuscripts and editions of the Bible in the original languages, so many various readings are found that it is impossible to determine by private judgment which is authentic. In the Hebrew text Dr. Kennicott reckons above *twelve thousand* variations. In the Greek text of the New Testament Mills has collected *thirty thousand* readings, and Wetstein a still larger number. In Tindal's Bible, Bishop Tunstal noted no less than *two thousand* corruptions in his translation of the New Testament. Mr. Broughton, a learned Protestant, wrote to the Lords of the Council to request a new translation; for, says he, 'that which is now in England is full of errors,' and he tells the Bishops, 'that their public translation of the scripture into English, is such that it prevents the text of the Old Testament in *eight hundred and forty-eight* places; and that it causes many to reject the New Testament and run into eternal flames.' Would Christ have suffered this were the Bible *alone* appointed by him for the rule of faith?

The principle of private judgment has been the prolific source of horribl

atrocities and monstrous errors; indeed there is hardly a crime or error which some have not endeavoured to justify by scriptural authority. When the Anabaptists in Germany took possession of the country, it was because Christ had promised 'that the meek should possess the earth.' When they plundered the property of the inhabitants, it was because God had commanded the Israelites to plunder the Egyptians. And when they overturned all civil government, they appealed to the words of Christ 'the Kings of the nations exercise lordship over them, *but it shall not be so with you.*' We have the Protestant authorities of Lord Clarendon and many others, for knowing that the regicides, who (after steeping their country in the best blood of her children) dethroned and murdered their king, were able to justify every crime by an appeal to the Bible. Let any one reflect on this and on the extravagant follies which Fox, Naylor, John of Layden, Johanna Southcote and hundreds of other deluded fanatics have supported by scripture distorted by their private judgment, and ask himself whether Christ could have assigned such a rule of faith to be the only one to direct aright his dearly redeemed and tenderly beloved children.

We are informed by St. Peter, that there are some things in the scripture hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction. Experience has fully verified this fact though Protestants would have us believe that all are competent to interpret the scripture and form their own creed out of it. But how different are these creeds! Trinitarians find in the scripture that Christ is God, but Whiston, Locke, the immortal Newton, the great Dr. Samuel Clarke, and Milton found in it that Christ is not God. If you interrogate the Protestant rule of faith, it will supply you with arguments in support of either the affirmative or the negative. If Christ has said, I and my Father are one,' he has also said, 'The Father is greater than I.' That one of these two passages is to be expounded by the other, is evident. But which ought to have the preference. The Protestant rule, when it is put to the test, is no rule at all. It does not, it cannot decide, you are at last obliged to determine yourself, but then it is not the scripture which is a rule to you, but you who are a rule to the scripture. This again St. Paul teaches that 'man is not justified by the works of the law but by the faith of Jesus Christ:' while St. James teaches, that 'by works a man is justified and not by faith only.' How will you reconcile these two passages? Will you adopt the words of St. Paul and endeavour to explain away those of St. James? or will you prefer those of St. James and endeavour to adapt them to those of St. Paul? In either case your rule is deficient. The true rules which you follow is your own judgment or rather conjecture. What conclusion can we draw from all this but that the scripture was never intended to serve as a rule of faith? The source of doubt and perplexity is not in it; but in those, who, without sufficient grounds, have of their own private authority, pronounced it to be a sole rule of Christian faith.

We may revert to this subject in order to adduce the sentiments of learned Protestants upon it. In the mean time we trust the *Christian Advocate* will not again call upon us to prove any part of our doctrine from the scripture alone, until he has solidly refuted the foregoing objections and clearly demonstrated that the scripture privately interpreted is the only rule of Christian faith, as he has so confidently asserted. When he has done this, it will then, and not till then, be incumbent on us either to prove our doctrine from scripture alone, or to abandon it.

STATISTICS OF CRIME IN PORTUGAL AND GREAT BRITAIN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—My time is unfortunately too much occupied to attempt giving that support to your useful journal that I could wish ; I cannot, however allow such observations as those made by the correspondent of the *Christian Advocate*, in his paper of the 20th, who signs himself *Sigma* to pass unnoticed. The latest work regarding Portugal that I have just now by me, on the accuracy of which I can depend, is that of Dr. Andrew Halliday, who quotes the population returns of 1812, and in referring to them I cannot refrain also from making an extract fully according with Dr. Milner's assertion;—be it remembered too, that Dr. Halliday was a Protestant,—he says 'a virtuous and loyal peasantry will at all times give stability to a throne. In this respect Portugal is peculiarly blessed, for the little intercourse which is kept up between different parts of the nation has entirely prevented the spreading of corruption to any great extent ; and in the interior, we find a happy, contented, and loyal race of inhabitants *among whom Christianity exists in somewhat of its primitive purity*, and who are blessed with a truly large portion of the milk of human kindness.' Such, have we testimony of this writer, were the Portuguese peasants a few years since : That they have differed in one title, has been caused by the internal dissensions created on the disputed sovereignty of the kingdom which has brought into her a host of hireling soldiers of fortune, the refuse and scum of the other nations of Europe. I need not remind your readers that the inquisition has long since been abolished after having been made use of as a merely *political* tool ; and that the Jesuits, whose virtues and eminent usefulness it is the habit of the writers in the *Christian Advocate* to endeavor to smother under such heaps of abuse, are without an establishment in the country ; these are historical facts too well known.

To proceed then, it is clear that we must make deductions from the 10,262 criminals both on account of political assumptions of crime, for what is rebellion in the eyes of the one party is loyalty to the other, and also on account of some acts considered merely as obnoxious to civil law elsewhere, for the purpose of making a comparison with other countries ; thus from

Sigma's	10,262
We must deduct Rebellions	627
Resisting Legal Authority.....	281
<i>Abuse of the Liberty of the Press</i>	19
<i>Suicides</i>	10
<i>Desertions</i>	392
The possession of destructive weapons.....	106
	1,435

8,827

therefore remain, of which 38 rioters, 3,283 street broilers and others might also be deducted, but we will allow *Sigma* the benefit of these and proceed with our calculations in proof of the injustice of his animadversions even on this disturbed, and abused country. The population, according to Halliday is 2,876,591 making the proportion of criminality to be *one* in 326, supposing the population not to have increased since 1812, though if we were to take the usual estimate of five persons to each house, there

being 749,529 the number of inhabitants would be 3,747,645 on a proportion of criminals of *one in 424*, but I will waive this objection. Now taking Great Britain in 1835, the latest that has yet reached India from Porters' Official Tables, we find the number of criminals to be 75,694 in a population of 23,755,431, or *one criminal in 314 inhabitants about 3½ per cent.* worse than is stated by *Sigma* to be the ratio in Portugal! even supposing the population in that country not to have increased since 1812, which is hardly possible, and be it remembered, these are absolute *convictions* not the mere *perpetrations* of crime. If we follow the mode of selection adopted by *Sigma* and take particular spots we shall find that in 1835 in one of the counties of Ireland the proportion of offenders was as high as *one in fifty-two*; and taking Ireland in 1837, for which I happen to have the returns, it appears that the ratio, among a population more than double that of Portugal was *one in 247*, there having been no less than 27,396 offenders in that year.

But further to point out the fallacy, to say nothing of the illiberality and injustice, of the conclusions arrived at by *Sigma* I will trouble you with one more evidence, that of Catholic France in the year 1826 (that being the latest of which I have accurate data by me) the offenders were 66,728 out of a population amounting to 29,236,000, being a ratio of *one in 438 or 39½ per cent.* better than in Great Britain.

I will only add that in this our adopted country of India, from the best accounts, the ratio of crime is supposed to be about *one in 380 inhabitants*.

In conclusion I give the *Christian Advocate* this bit of advice; to be cautious how he puts forth without due consideration statements calculated to throw obloquy on a whole people, lest he be committed, as in this instance, which will I hope prove a salutary lesson, shewing that 'facts are stubborn things' no less than that there are those watching his vague assertions who can bring them to bear in a cool, but, I trust I have shewn, conclusive form.

24th July, 1839.

VINDEX.

THE ADVOCATE'S RELIGIOUS POSITION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—Your mighty belligerent, the *Christian Advocate*, has, in a luminous article of seven columns, given us *some idea* of the 'position' he holds among the sects of Protestants. He declares that '*we set not up any form of Protestantism as a perfect example, nor do we take any man as our leader or our guide*'!! Credat Judæus!! What then in the name of common sense is your redoubtable brother of the *Advocate*? Is he another LUTHER who vauntingly declared 'at first I stood alone,' or is he a *Protestant General* in charge of the consciences of the 'Gentlemen of the different religious denominations,' who conduct the *Christian Advocate*? Why does your brother tantalize us by not openly avowing his 'position' as well as of his worthy coadjutors in the glorious work of *Decatholization*. This is, indeed, too bad. He apparently belongs to no Church, for an invisible Church is no Church at all, otherwise what becomes 'of the predictions of the Prophets respecting Jesus Christ's future Church, where they describe it as a *Mountain on the top of Mountains*, Is. ii. 2, Mich. iv. 2., and as a city whose *watchmen shall never hold their peace*, Is.

lxii., 6 and, indeed of the injunction of our Lord himself *to tell the Church*, Matt. xviii 17.*

But allow me to analyze the declaration of the *Protestant General*, the reclaimers of Catholics! He modestly avers that he does not set up *any form* of Protestantism as a *perfect* example! Your good brother might have spared himself the task of proclaiming the imperfect system of Protestantism, which to us, Catholics, is a truism; but I cannot help admiring his consistency in wishing to reclaim us to a system which he himself declares is *not perfect*! and with admirable coolness further declares '*nor do we take any man as our leader or our guide*!' Surely your cotemporary is not in earnest? He professes to take no man as *his* leader or his guide, and yet with sterling consistency *he* would lead and guide us, poor Catholics, to the path of eternity! Truly good generalissimo 'none is so blind as he that will not see,' and if thou sincerely thinkest with the *Expositor*, that the highest interests of truth, your best and dearest hopes are at stake, write sensibly and consistently, and do not make 'confusion worse confounded.' Adopt first a more perfect form of Protestantism thyself, and then it will be time enough to think of reclaiming Catholics, whose Church, according to Divine pledge, is built on a rock against which the errors of hell shall not prevail, *as long as the sun and moon shall endure*, Psalm lxxxix. What can thy puny efforts avail, Oh conductors of the *Christian Advocate*, since the experience of eighteen centuries has confirmed our faith in the Holy Catholic Church. 'During this long interval kingdoms and empires have risen and fallen, the inhabitants of every country have been repeatedly changed; in short, every thing has changed except the doctrines and jurisdiction of the Catholic Church, which are precisely the same now, that Christ and his Apostles left them. In vain did Pagan Rome, during three centuries exert its force to drown her in her own blood; in vain did Arianism and the other cotemporary heresies sap her foundations, during two centuries or more; in vain did hordes of barbarians from the north, and of Mohametans from the south rush forward to overwhelm her; in vain did Luther swear that he himself would be her death.* She has survived these, and numerous other enemies equally redoubtable; and she will survive even the fury and machinations of *anti-Christian* Philosophy though directed against her exclusively'!! Yes, Conductors of the *Advocate*, what Cedars have failed to accomplish can Oziers, like you, compass? Wipe off the flattering unction from your souls, and do not follow the example of Julian, the Emperor, who wished to falsify the prophecy of Daniel by attempting to rebuild the Jewish temple. In allusion to which, the great Chrysostom exclaimed: 'Behold the Temple of Jerusalem; God has destroyed it: have men been able to restore it? Behold the Church of Christ; God has built it: have men been able to destroy it?'

Luther, the father of the Reformation, says Bishop Challoner, notwithstanding his violent humour and bitter declamations against the Catholics, could not help acknowledging in his book against the Anabaptists, 'That under the Papacy are many good *Christian* things, yea, *all that is good, in Christianity*, and that Protestants had it from thence. Moreover, that *under the Papacy is true Christianity*, even the very kernel of Christianity.' Whilst Luther was thus forced to grant that Catholics have the very ker-

* Luther ordered this epitaph to be engraved on his tomb: *Pestis eram vivens, moriens ero mors tua Papa.*

nel of Christianity, it is feared he had kept nothing for himself but the shell. If the 'different-religious-denomination-conductors,' of the Protestant *Christian Advocate*, in quality of his children, have inherited any part of his treasure, I do not envy them, the inheritance, but shall leave them in the quiet possession of it. This was the way in which Challoner addressed one of his opponents; and, I trust, it is as applicable here.

29th July, 1839,

VERAX.

CONVERSION OF THE REVEREND PIERCE CONNELLY, A.M.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

DEAR SIR,—Permit me to submit the accompanying account of the Conversion of the Reverend Pierce Connelly, A.M., Rector of the Protestant Episcopalian Congregation at Natchez, in the State of Mississippi, to the Catholic Faith, and to solicit the favor of obtaining for it a place in your journal, as early as practicable.

I fear the article will be found too long to insert it in one number of the *Expositor*, I would therefore respectfully beg to suggest, that the subject be divided, and given in two successive numbers.*

Should this article meet the eye of 'Theophilus' or that of the Editor of the *Calcutta Protestant Christian Advocate*, it may explain to them the reason why thoughtful, and meditative, 'Pious and Enlightened Protestants attend worship in Popish Sanctuaries.'

ANTI-CALUMNY.

Selections.

CONVERSION OF THE REVEREND PIERCE CONNELLY, A.M.

Mr. Connelly, who has been lately received into the Catholic Church at Rome, is a native of Philadelphia. His father was an elder in one of the Presbyterian Churches in that city, but he was himself bred an Episcopalian. Having taken orders, he was, after repeated evidences of unyielding virtue and superior talent, appointed to the rectorship of the Protestant Episcopalian congregation at Natchez, in the State of Mississippi. Of his conduct in that station, Dr. Otey, Protestant Bishop of Tennessee, after visiting the diocese of Mississippi, made a report in the following terms:—'I take great pleasure here in bearing testimony to the faithful labours of the rector of this parish. With real satisfaction I listened to the pious instruction, the affectionate expostulations, the impressive warnings, which marked the character of his addresses to his people. Great is their responsibility, and awful the reckoning which awaits the neglect or misimprovement of their distinguished privileges.'

In a letter dated Natchez, 20th, August, 1835, addressed to his friend Mr. J. N. N., a copy of which now lies before us in manuscript, Mr. Connelly states that he had been for some time engaged in severe study, the result of which he describes in these terms:—

'My faith in Protestantism is so shaken, that I am compelled in conscience to lay aside for the present my functions; I begin to think the necessary tendency of Protestantism is revolutionary, immoral, and irreligious; that its success has been accidental, and that it has in itself no principle of duration.' 'My present design is,' he adds, 'to place myself within reach of full information on the Roman Catholic side. If my doubts are confirmed, I shall not hesitate to seek to be reconciled to the Church of Rome, and place myself under the discipline and at the disposal of their ecclesiastical authority. If I find

* Vide Selections.—PRINTER.

difficulties in that Church equal to those of the Protestant, I confess I shall think that there is left for me but a choice of evils. Irresistible proofs and undeniable principles, however, seem to lead to a more certain result; and I trust I am ready, whenever the angel of duty calls me, '*circumdare mihi vestimentum meum et sequi illum*. But I owe it to truth and to myself, that no precipitancy should lessen the weight of so important a step. It is indeed to me, personally, immensely important in every point of view. You must have been a Protestant, an American or an English Protestant, to be able to estimate the consequences. It is not only giving up the honors and emoluments of my profession and my standing, but it is to be attended with the rage and malignity, the abuse and the calumny, of the *pious*: public, and the alienation of kindred and friends, which to a great extent are sure to follow, in the north at least. My first object, of course, is to inform myself fully of the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Roman Catholic Church, as established by received general councils; my next to compare its moral influence with that of the so called Reformed Faith.'

On the 26th of the same month, Mr. Connelly communicated his thoughts and feelings upon this subject to Dr. Otey, whom he addresses in the most affectionate and respectful manner, as his 'Dear Bishop,' his 'truly honoured and Right Reverend Father':—

'I know the grief that what I am going to tell you will create; but I know, too, you will respect the integrity and the frankness of the course which I adopt. The attacks from every quarter upon the Roman Catholic Church, have forced me into a laborious study of the controversy, and I confess my faith is shaken in the Protestant religion. I have resigned my parish, my kind, my generous parish, and have laid aside the active functions of my profession, to weigh deliberately and devoutly my future duty. I know how great a sacrifice I make, of feeling as well as interest. I know how much greater a one I may still have to make, and indeed all to which I may expose myself. I pretend not to say where the truth will lead me; I only am persuaded of my present duty, and am determined by the help of God, to follow it. The intention of my vows I have no doubt about; it is only, of where I ought to pay them, that I am uncertain. My allegiance as an ecclesiastic, I now fear may perhaps have been mistaken. I will always shew it was at least sincere.

'Subordination I consider the first principle of all law; a thing as necessary in the church, and in every other society, as the soul is to the body; and obedience with me is not more a duty of my profession than it is a requisite of my nature, I have no faith in private inspiration, I have no faith in individual infallibility, or any absolute personal independence; as a church-man especially, I have no such presumptuous self-confidence in the great congregation of Christ's flock I feel myself nothing. I must have some guide to lead me in truth, I must have some power to obey, and I cannot think my obedience what it ought to be, if it is not of the heart as well as of the lips, if it is not in the spirit as well as according to the letter.

'Do not suppose, dear Bishop, my present feelings are any momentary impulse; they are the result of anxious study, they have given me many sleepless nights and brought me low in health; and do not think I have been led to them by any novel or exterior influence; I have read not one of the recent publications for the Roman Catholics, and certainly nearly all against them; I have had no communication on the subject with any clergyman or layman of their church, nor have I consulted on the step I now take with any human being whatever. It is from a most *exparte* Protestant examination of the subject, that I have come to the doubts and the conclusions which I now send you; the subject moreover forced upon me solely by our own church, and her vociferous terrors in England, and at home.

'In England there was an apology in her connexion with the state, and I was willing to believe that it was only because the government trembled for itself that the cry was raised of danger to the church; but in this country the fears of our church are all her own, and they are really for herself: if these fears are reasonable they condemn our religion, if they are unreasonable they condemn ourselves.'

Mr. Connelly then proceeds to observe, that so deep is his faith in Christianity, that he is entirely willing to trust it to itself, and to the help of God. 'Its condition is surely not worse now, than at its rise; let it then go on now, as it did at first begin; let it be contented to rely on the gradually developed force of its own truth, and the simple manifestation of the beauty of its holiness.' What it seems to me, is really to be feared, is the delusion of Christians, not the ruin of the church; the confounding of the interests of religion with the interests of something else connected with it, as government, or society, or the press. I hate the English phrase of national church, and national religion. I would no more have national, than individual interests mixed up with the interests of THE CHURCH. I would have all men fellow subjects in

this one kingdom, brethren in this universal family. And just as truly do I hate the fanatic cry about religious societies and the religious press. The terms might pass as jargon; but they both spring from, and they both inculcate, a great ANTI-CHRISTIAN LIE. For such I believe it to be, *that the church of Christ requires not the aid of civil government, or of any secular societies.* She can do without them all. They, it is, who have need of her; they, it is, who are desirous to make use of her. When states seek the aid of any religion, it is a confession that they require it: when they give their service and their support, it is because they hope to be repaid; and so too it is with the *religious* associations and the stipendiary press. Let government break off its union with the church. Let the hireling writers and printers of religion withdraw their help and Christianity will stand and grow in the midst of fanaticism and democracy, as stand and grow it did in the midst of idolatry and despotism.'

Mr. Connelly continues:—'The Church establishment in Ireland is gone; with every advantage in the struggle, it has been put down. That its overthrow in England is at hand, I now, for the first time, cease to doubt. When the support of government is taken away, it will not be long before the Protestant church stands in that country, as it does in this. How does it stand here? How will it stand there? Trusting in itself, and in the promise of the SON of GOD? In nothing less. The great necessities of the clergy seem to have destroyed their faith. They have created an immense machinery, which they do not pretend to wield. They have made an ungodly covenant with printers and fanatics, by which the church has given itself up to a power, which it never can controul, and which, indeed, long since, has openly begun to govern.'

After some further observations upon the state of religion in the United States, in which he shews that *the church* there is really governed by the mob, that 'any majority of any committee has the authority of a council.' Mr. Connelly points out the unhappy consequences of this state of things, so far as true religion is concerned, and observes that it gave rise in his mind to the important question which he was then about to examine—'the question of the nature and identity of the visible BODY OF CHRIST,* of the spiritual authority and moral influence of the Universal Church.'

On the 6th of September, 1835, Mr. Connolly preached his farewell sermon to his parishioners at Natchez. A more affecting discourse than this we have never read. He, very truly states, that for four thousand years the Gentiles were allowed to wander, seeking of their wise men, what was truth—that they were like sheep deserted upon the mountains, until God sent forth his son to gather the scattered flocks, that they might be of *one* flock, under *one* shepherd. It was his resolution to seek the fold where that flock was to be found.—'In bidding you farewell, with words of heartfelt truth, my brethren, 'thoughts crowd upon me! The scenes which we have shared together, come up again before me. How regularly have I received you at these sacred rails! How often have we knelt beside the bed, and stood around the grave to weep and pray for those we loved, in life, or 'look with awe upon the dust' of those we sepulchred in hope at death! And how shall I forget my happy days amongst you, blest, I sometimes fear perhaps, far more than blessing! How shall I thank you, for all your confidence and your generous regard; for all your goodness, not only to me personally, but to those dearer than myself! And how do I now humbly, crave your pardon, if in a parish, where I never met with an offence, I have ever wounded, even in the least, the feelings of any single human being.'

Mr. Connelly having thus resigned his parish, and given up an income sufficient to secure to himself and his family a competency, he set forth a pilgrim in the search of truth. He proceeded to Rome, where he studied our religion at its fountain-head, and the result was, that he has become one of its most ardent disciples. After remaining at Rome during the spring of this year, he proceeded to England on a visit to the Earl of Shrewsbury, with whom he is now spending some time at Alton Towers. We had the pleasure of becoming acquainted with him during the short stay he made in London; and

* Eph. IV. 12.

in reply to the questions which we put to him upon the subject of his conversion, he placed in our hands the following communication, which we now present to the reader. It is in itself the artless portrait of a strong and amiable mind, deeply imbued with the spirit of piety, utterly free from fanaticism, superior to all passions and interests of a secular character, and borne onward to truth by an irresistible solicitude to discover the one fold, the one shepherd, under whose protection it might lie down and be at rest.

'In looking back upon the course and progress of my *ébranlement*, next to the most unmerited favour of that grace which, with the deepest humility, and most fervent thanksgiving, I acknowledge and adore, what most amazes me is the confidence and boldness with which I took the first decided step in writing and printing my letter to the bishop. So far as human reasons can account for it, I must in a great degree attribute that confidence to my acquaintance with a distinguished foreigner in the winter of thirty-three and thirty-four. The Chevalier N. then on a scientific tour through North America, was a man of extensive and profound philosophy as well as science, of a reputation already established, and of an exactness of mind and a largeness of comprehension, as well as a sincerity of purpose, altogether remarkable. He had already travelled for two years in the United States, and I could not but be amazed as well as delighted at the attention which, in the midst of his more professional labours he had paid to all the religious and political institutions of the country. The amount of information, the facts, the documents he had collected, were truly wonderful. As the natural result of our intimacy, he applied upon a variety of subjects to my experience as a clergyman and as a citizen, and our intercourse by degrees assumed an interest of the highest, and I need not hesitate to say of the purest kind. It never indeed turned upon differences of religious faith, much less partook of the nature of controversy. It was more about systems of philosophy and politics, a comparison of moral views, and of notes already made by each. Struck with coincidences frequently where I least expected them, and an entire approbation of 'thoughts' which I had never ventured to utter except in the secrecy of a common-place book, I confess I felt for the first time a confidence in the opinions which I formed, and in myself, which I had never allowed myself to feel before. I had been in an agreeable and cultivated social circle, but I had been in solitude as to political, philosophical, and theological associations. The men of my own profession whom I had left in the northern cities, and those near me in the south, I well knew differed from me fundamentally on many points of civil as well as ecclesiastical polity, and I required some other encouragement than that of my own mind to enable me to trust to my reasonings, and to believe in the justness of them. This I found in my intercourse with this learned stranger, and though I still swore by *Blackwood* and the *London Quarterly*, I learnt to allow myself to dissent without remorse from their clever, and I still think, plausible inconsistencies. Dear old *Ebony*! I can scarcely now refrain from wandering far off from my subject when I think of all the delight and all the affection too, with which, seated around the table or on the gallery of that dear cottage in the warm south-west, we used to read the beautiful Greek articles, or John Wilson's sweeter poems, instead of music of an evening; so blinded by long admiration as to reprobate nothing, not even their juxtaposition with speeches from men like Mortimer O'Sullivan.

'It has been said, and by a no less respectable authority than that of my former venerated bishop, that my change of religious faith is, in a great degree, to be attributed to my political principles. But even if my conversion were the result of observations and inferences drawn from public events, it must at least be owned that the arguments made use of by conservatives were more likely to prejudice me against than in favour of the Catholic religion, and it was certainly the high Tory and the high Church press, which turned my thoughts into the channel which they followed. I confess, I am not aware, that arguments for or against praying to saints, purgatory, or even transubstantiation, ever had much weight with me. If the Church of England had continued to teach on that vexed point just what it had done in the time of Queen Elizabeth, I doubt not, I should have quietly received it. And most honest high churchmen, I think, will candidly confess the same. There is more proof in Scripture to sustain it than the Trinity, and surely nothing more *contrary* to reason in one doctrine than in the other. And, if the Church or the Convocation, or even that General Convention in the United States, which quietly dropped out an article in the Apostles' creed had set forth a 'Book of Sports,' I should certainly have been recommending a cheerful spending of the Sunday as in the days of Charles I., instead of condemning young and old to do penance within doors, as is the rubric now. I was in good truth a high churchman. I *did* believe the 'Church hath authority,' and without, indeed, having very definite ideas of what 'the Church' is, I thought all my duty was to keep my vows and 'hear the Church,' believing and teaching just what she decreed should be believed and taught. Nor indeed, could I, or can I ever conceive the practicability of acting upon the notion of private judgment. Men were never meant to wander alone in faith or in life, but to be governed in society. And men are not the less governed because they do not acknowledge themselves to be so. If they will not submit to an unchanging authority, there is

nothing left for them but what is unfixed ; if they will not listen to infallibility, they must take up with that which may be error ; but governed they must be, for it is all nonsense to think that merely *protesting* will make a religion, or that having no head will keep men together. The only consequence of a real independence would be a real irresponsibility. But it is impossible not to see that there is neither the one nor the other. Rewards and emoluments, pains and penalties, are distributed by congregations, and communities of Protestants as much as by conclaves of cardinals ; and popular opinion takes the place of the council of Trent, just as the people reign instead of the King. The majority are the real head of the Protestant Church in America—the ministry, Whig or Tory, as it may be, are the real head of it in England and Ireland ; and what that Church teaches now, is no more what that Church taught in the days of Henry, James, or good Queen Anne, or will teach some hundred years hence, should it last so long, than Archbishop Laud is like Dr. Blomfield, or Hooker like—some Wilberforce a century more diluted.

Change and disorganization are the natural tendencies of Protestant principles. These tendencies may be less manifest in England and on the continent than in the United States ; but they, nevertheless, may easily be proved, and must continue to increase, for in proportion as the institutions of a country are popular, so must the religion of the people have a political as well as ecclesiastical character, and if religion is to become merely another engine in the hands of the people, instead of the last and only barrier to restrain them, God only knows what duration or stability can be hoped for any liberal governments. My sentiments on this subject, however, you already are acquainted with, from my printed 'Letter,' and from an unprinted one to the Catholic Bishop of Charleston. This last, written when I little expected to be driven by a sense of duty to renounce the Protestant religion, will shew you not only its revolutionary, but its intolerant and exclusive spirit in the United States ; the more ungenerous and unjust, because, though the constitution and the liberal spirit of the people prevent the preference of one form of Christianity to another on the part of government, it is yet notorious that all the immense grants made to colleges and universities, fall entirely under the direction of the Protestant clergymen, and that whatever professors or chaplains are employed in the army or navy of the country are invariably of that religion. But if the illegitimate influences of my religion weighed heavily upon my mind, my excellent Bishop can bear witness that I was not less depressed at the consideration of its want of power for all the true purposes of Christianity. It is as inefficient in its own hands, as it is dangerous and mischievous in the hands of those that wield it. There is not the shadow of discipline other than what the press or communities exercise. There is no bond of union, no spiritual subordination, no ecclesiastical spirit in the body of the clergy. Their sad readiness, whenever either dependant or ambitious, to run with any prevailing folly of the times, is almost as general as their contempt of rubrics, canons, and solemn vows, is open and unhesitating when not enforced by popular caprice. And the most important of all their duties, the spiritual care and pious education of the young, is either not entrusted to them, or is neglected in a manner as flagrant as it is dreadful. Their missionary efforts among Pagan nations have been utterly unfruitful. The moral operation of all the vast charlatan machinery is at best worthless. Infidelity has increased beyond the spread of tracts and Bibles ; and the best respect which the public functions of religion have, and the largest subscriptions to the great societies, are often paid by men who have become the involuntary, but secretly acknowledged victims of infidelity. These are melancholy facts, but they are facts which are not to be disproved : and well I know how many wise and pious Protestants acquiesce in them with grief and bitterness. God knows, I was not a hasty judge, nor even willing to be persuaded ; sadly and reluctantly I saw the evidence forced upon me of the spiritual character of the Church, upon which, in the feebleness of my faith, I imagined the hopes of Christianity principally rested.

The depression I felt at the approach of such convictions was not likely to be diminished by my professional occupations. I was connected with a parish which, interesting for many causes, must have been truly dear to me if only for the general affection and respect, and generosity ever manifested to my family. But the steady and conscientious performance of pastoral duties brings with it, in any parish, a daily increasing sense of responsibility, as well as a growing personal attachment ; and my heart has many a time failed within me as I saw near at hand only a confirmation of what was true elsewhere. The Bishop must well remember, how sincerely, but how vainly, I combated the melancholy with which my own experience and my own convictions often overwhelmed me. During his welcome visit in the winter of 1835-6, he gave me certainly encouragements and consolations which I remember, as I always must do every thing connected with our intercourse, with the most grateful and sincere affection. He is a prelate whom his Church may well boast of as an example of wise and laborious zeal, of generous disinterested charity, and most unaffected piety. But for the encouragements I was indebted to himself, and his perfect sincerity, not to the justness of his principles—and the consolations sprung from the sympathy of a warm and noble nature, rather than from any well grounded prospect of ultimate success. The parish certainly had great external prosperousness, but Protestant Christianity has no real success. It lives only in excitement or physical support. Its prosperity, whether in parishes or in the world, is out-

ward, hollow, material. The graces of the christian life are sometimes beautifully seen in individuals, but with the great majority of those professing that religion, it is something more or less christianized, rather than christianity; something instead of His religion, rather than what the religion of our Saviour truly is: and so it has been in faith and practice since ever and wherever confession has been abandoned, just as the original, object of religious assemblies has been forgotten wherever the ritual of Rome has been mutilated or exploded. The reasons of all these things did not indeed soon strike me and in the midst of the course of reading which the miserable fanaticism of the periodicals drove me into, perhaps it was the consideration of the spiritual state of the negro population, and the necessity of something more Catholic for them than the Protestant religion, that first opened my eyes to apprehensions of the truth, and pointed out to me the course which it became my duty to pursue. I had nearly completed and had actually begun to print 'A Catechism for the Religious Instruction of the Negroes,' when I closed the church of Natchez, which was only re-opened for my farewell sermon.'

We need not add a word of commentary to this simple and beautiful narrative. It is to be regretted that Mr. Connelly's marriage state of necessity precludes him from entering the sacred ministry of our Church. But we trust that his talents, his acquirements, and his conspicuous virtues, may not be lost to the service of that religion which he has embraced at the expense of much that was dear to him in life—his fortune—the affections of his kindred—his station—and the friendship of the people whose instructor he had so long been.

We had written thus far, when we were favoured with a perusal of Dr. Otey's reply to Mr. Connelly's letter, already quoted. It is of considerable length, and is conceived throughout in a christian spirit of charity worthy of his office. It may be truly said to be, from beginning to end, one effusion of tender affection and esteem for a *dearly beloved brother*, who has separated himself from his pastoral care, on the purest motives of conscientious feeling; for, whilst deeply regretting, and delicately expostulating upon, a step he does not, of course, approve of, this letter breathes in every line a conviction of the honorable principles upon which Mr. Connelly has acted. It is, indeed, a delightful testimonial for this gentleman of the estimation in which he was held, when the individual best qualified to judge of his value, and most alive to the loss sustained in his defection from the Protestant Church, expresses himself in such terms.—*Dublin Review*, No. ii, 1836.

PROTESTANT CONVERSIONS IN INDIA.

The Missionary Reports, during these times of unprofitable labour, show that some sheep were received into the flock, and professed Christianity. Yet who were these? Almost universally of the very lowest description of persons; not the worse or less worthy because they were of low caste, but because their example could not only be of little efficacy for others, but was indeed a cause to deter the junction of those of higher rank. And who were those who actually did join? They were generally persons in low and distressed circumstances, who, by adopting Christianity, obtained for themselves food and lodging; consequently, when the hour of need was over, or better prospects offered, they left their refuge, and being purged of their new faith, returned to the bosom of error. We say not this of every one—but of how many it is true, the missionary records can tell.—*Oriental Herald*, April 1839.

THE ALLIANCE BETWEEN POPERY AND HEATHENISM.

Letter II. Concluded.—Dr. Wiseman to Mr. Poynder.

But I am willing to take the comparison on the broadest grounds which you propose. You imagine that little or no change has taken place in the Pantheon, by the Substitution of all the saints in it for all the gods. I presume you would not quarrel with a heathen temple being changed into a church; for you have not scrupled to occupy our churches, even without

a thorough Knoxian purgation.* But I will suppose, if you please, an ancient Roman revisiting that temple: the first thing which would strike him would be the sign of salvation—the image of Christ crucified, raised upon every altar,—and most conspicuously upon the principal and central one. On the right, the picture of one whom men are stoning, while he with eyes uplifted prays for their conversion, would rivet his attention; and on the left, the modest statue of a virgin, with an infant in her arms, would invite him to enquiry. Then he would see monuments of men, whose clasped or crossed hands, express how they expired in the prayer of hope: the inscription on one side would tell him how the immortal Raphael had willed, that no ornament should deck his tomb, but that very statue of God's mother which he had given to that church; another informs you, that the illustrious statesman (Consalvi), after bequeathing the fortune he had made in the service of the public, without reserve, to the propagation of Christianity among distant nations, would have no tomb; but that his friends had, as it were by stealth, erected him that modest memorial. Around him he would see, at whatever hour of the day he might enter, solitary worshippers, who gently come in through the ever unclosed brazen portals, to keep watch, like the lamp which sheds its mild light upon them, before the altar of God. And, I fancy it would be no difficult task, with these objects before us, to expound and fully develope to him the Christian faith; the life of our Redeemer, beginning with his birth from a virgin, to his death upon a cross; the testimony to his doctrine, and the power which accompanied it, exhibited in the triumph of the first among his martyrs; the humble and modest virtue his teaching inspired to his followers, their contempt of worldly praise, and the fixing of their hopes upon a better world; the constant and daily influence his religion exercises among its believers, whom it sweetly invites and draws to breathe a solitary prayer, amidst the turmoils of a busy life. And methinks this ancient heathen would have an idea of a religion immensely different from that which he had professed—the religion of the meek and of the humble, of the persecuted and the modest, of the devout and the chaste. I believe, too, that by seeing the substitution of symbol for symbol,—of the cross, the badge of ignominy, with its unresisting victim, for the haughty thunderer,—of the chastest of virgins for the lascivious Venus,—of the forgiving Stephen for the avenging god of war,—he would thereby conceive a livelier idea of the overthrow of his idolatry by the mildest of doctrines, of the substitution of Christianity for heathenism, than if the temple had been merely stripped and left a naked hall, or a tottering ruin.

For I think that the ark of God, standing in the very temple of Dagon, with the idol at its side, broken and so maimed that it might no longer be made to stand upon its pedestal, would convey a prouder and stronger demonstration of the superiority of the Law to the religion of Syria, than when concealed in silence behind the curtain of the sanctuary. And, in fact, so far were the ancient pagans from considering the substitution of Christian emblems for those of their religion, as only a modification of the same worship, that nothing enraged them more, or made them feel more keenly the change which had been introduced. Julian, the apostate, thus writes to the Christians:—‘You, oh hapless men! while you refuse to adore the shield descended from Jove, (the ancile which you somewhere compare to a popish thing) ‘which the great Jupiter, or our Father Mars, sent down, given a pledge, not by words but by deeds, of sure protection to our city, adore the wood of the cross, signing its image on your foreheads, and sculpturing it on the front of your houses.’ You see, therefore, that Julian did not think the substitution of our symbols for those of heathenism any continuation of the same religion.

And I might here ask you, what sort of Christians these were, who are thus accused of substituting the cross for the ancile, and superstitiously

* At least as to the *first* point of his system: the second was pretty well understood in both countries. ‘The *first* invasion was upon the Idolatry; and thare after the common Pepill began to seik sum Spoyll.’—*Historie of the Reformation in Scotland*, p. 128.

signing it on their foreheads? Were they Protestants, or do not these practices strangely savour of Popery? Now mark St. Cyril's answer. He does not deny the facts—he does not enter into any long explanations—he answers as a Catholic child might answer your cavils, from the words of his catechism,—that Christians 'are indeed careful, and esteem it a primary duty —(ἐν φροντίδι θεμελίους καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὅτι μάλιστα κατεσπουδασμένοις)—always to mark the cross upon their foreheads and houses, because it brought to their remembrance how one, dying upon the cross, banished the devil from the kingdom he had usurped over all men, and with him his evil powers, whom our calumniator calls tutelary deities: and here too they are reminded of the spiritual blessings purchased for us on the cross.* And again allow me to ask, would you or I, in other words, your religion or mine, have met the objection in these terms? Who then were the Christians whom Julian attacked, and Cyril defended? I will gladly yield you the full benefit of the former's alliance, and contentedly put up with the second's reply, and the faith and practice it supposes. In fact the Theodosian code orders heathen temples to be destroyed, and 'expiated by placing thereon the sign of the venerable Christian religion.†

But, to return to my parallel. After having thus allowed the heathen to discover, if he could, his ancient worship and morality in the very Roman Church which you have chosen, and explained to him the doctrines there taught, I would bring him to the only splendid temple in this country wherein the Catholic religion has never been exercised, and where alone it has left no vestige of its truths and practices. I would bring him, after duly paying his entrance fee, into the cathedral of St. Paul's and desire him to *Guess* the religion to which it belonged. Would not his first question be, does it belong to *any* religion? is it a place of worship at all? No altar, no chapel, no emblem of any holy thought is visible; no point towards which men turn, as strongly concentrating the divine presence; no emblem of a peculiar dedication; not a worshipper or a reverential spectator; not one who, as he crosses the threshold, prepares his soul, as if approaching God, in prayer. There he sees men, with their heads covered as if in the public street, walking to and fro, looking at the edifice only as an architectural wonder, cut off by a stockade from the great nave, because so little respect is paid to it, that, if open, it would be profaned without scruple; while the jibe and the joke, or the state of the funds, or the scandal of the day, alone divide with their well-taxed curiosity, the conversation of the various groups. Would he, so far, see any thing to show him that he stood in a place for *Christian* worship? Might not the organ suggest to him that it is a hall for festive meetings? Might not the mouldy banners that wave above him, lead him to imagine it was the curia or the senate-house of the city? But one circumstance alone might lead him to some accurate judgment; the seeing how here, one portion of the building, precisely its *cella*, is parted off and closely screened from the gaze and the tread of the profane; and as he had not seen any thing of this sort in the Catholic Church, and it exactly corresponds to the form of his temples, assuredly he might suspect some still closer analogies.‡

But while he thus felt himself at a loss to discover what religion claimed the possession of this temple, I would direct his attention another way, and bid him look among the tombs and costly monuments which surround him, for some intimation of what god is here worshipped, and what virtues taught.

* Juliani Apostatæ Opera, ut sup. ed. Spanheim, vol. ii. p. 194.

† Cod. Theodos. lib. xvi. p. 526, ed. Cujac.

‡ Mr. Poynder quotes Kennet sometimes; I will therefore quote him too:—'Some curious persons have observed this similitude between the shape of these old temples, and our modern churches; that they had one apartment more holy than the rest, which they termed *cella*, answering to our chancel or choir.'—*Antiquities of Rome*, p. 41. In the Roman and Italian churches this does not exist.

There he sees emblems indeed in sufficient number,—not the cross, or the dove, or the olive branch, as on the ancient tomb, but the drum and the trumpet, the boarding-pike and the cannon. Who are they whose attitudes and actions are deemed the fit ornaments for this religious temple? Men, rushing forward with sword in hand, to animate their followers to the breach, or falling down while boarding the enemy's deck; heroes, if you chuse, benefactors to their country, but surely not the illustrators of religion. Of one it is said, that he died as a Roman would certainly have wished him, after having grappled with his enemy's ship, and rendered the destruction of one or both secure; the epitaph of another is expressed in the words of his commander's despatch; that of a third, in the vote of the House of Commons; not a word of a single Christian virtue, of a thought for God, of a hope of heaven; not a hint that one professed or believed in any religion. And would not the heathen rejoice to have found a temple, where the courage of the three hundred Fabii, or the self-devotion of the Decii, or the virtues of the Scipios, were so plainly taught, and held up to the practical admiration and imitation of men?

And how would his delight encrease, on more closely inspecting the emblems under which these virtues or their circumstances are expressed. Sea and river gods, with their oozy crowns, and out-pouring vases; the Ganges with his fish and calabash; the Thames, with the *genii* of his confluent streams; and the Nile, with his idol the *sphinx*: *Victory*, winged and girt up as of old, placing earthly laurel on the brows of the falling; *Fame*, with its ancient trumpet, blasting forth their worldly merits; *Clio*, the offspring of Apollo, recording their history; and, besides these, new creations of god and goddesses, *Rebellion* and *Fraud*, *Valour* and *Sensibility*; *Britannia*, the very copy of his own worshipped *Roma*; and some of these, too, with an unseemly lack of drapery, more becoming an ancient than a modern temple. This assemblage of ancient deities, as the only symbols to instruct his eye, would assuredly go far to confirm him, either that his ancient religion, its emblems, and its morality, had never been supplanted, or had lately been restored. Little would it boot to explain to him, how behind that screen a sacred book was read to a few people once a week,—to empty benches every day,—which teaches men to abhor his idolatry, and worship God in spirit: and that learned men there preach homilies on the peril of idolatry, and the danger of admitting even symbols into worship. All this would, I think, but perplex him the more. If you are not permitted to make any images, or to have them in your temple, he would ask, why break the law only in favour of warriors and river-gods? If you are allowed, why are the Christians of Rome to be denounced and anathematized for erecting those of Christ and his saints? And truly, I have no hesitation in saying, that if he reasoned as you have done, and followed your principles of judgment; if he pronounced upon religion by the shell, and not by the kernel—by the body, not by the soul—by the outward forms, not by the belief which they express; and if he persisted, like you, in giving credit to his own impressions and preconceived judgments, rather than to the protestations and declarations of those with whom he deals; I have no hesitation in saying, that he would see a much fainter impress of Christian thought in the Protestant than in the Catholic temple—much greater memorials of proscribed idolatry in the English than in the Roman cathedral.

Such, however, are not the tests which I should suggest to him. I would send him into a neighbouring island to study its history, and the conduct of those who have there taught the two conflicting religions, with a text in his hand, which would decide the point upon higher authority than yours or mine. In which of the two clergies has the following comparison been fulfilled, or which hath shown more propensity to do that which is attributed in it to the heathen? 'Be not solicitous, therefore, saying;—what shall we eat, or what shall we drink, or wherewith shall we be clothed? FOR AFTER ALL THESE THINGS DO THE HEATHENS SEEK. . . . Seek ye, therefore, first, the Kingdom of God and his justice.'—Matt. vi. 31. I am, &c.

DECLARATION OF THE CATHOLIC BISHOPS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

(Continued from No. 4, page 62.)

SECTION VI.

On Indulgences.

The Catholic Church is charged with encouraging guilt, by *giving leave to commit sin, and granting an anticipated pardon for sins to come by indulgences.*

The Catholic Church rejects with abhorrence the imputation, that by granting an indulgence, she grants permission to commit sin, or a pardon for sins to come. An indulgence in the sense of the Catholic Church, is no pardon for sin at all; it is only a remission of the whole or of a part of the temporal punishment, which the justice of God often reserves to be undergone by the sinner, after the guilt of the sin has been remitted. The power of granting the remission of this temporal punishment was given by Christ to St. Peter and his successors, and has been exercised from the earliest ages. An indulgence, so far from exempting sinners from works of penance and piety, is an encouragement to the performance of such works, since they are prescribed as conditions for gaining the benefit of an indulgence.

Surely, therefore, the doctrine of the Catholic Church concerning the sacrament of penance, confession and indulgences, does not tend to relax Christian morality, nor to encourage guilt, nor facilitate the commission of crime, but rather to put an end to sin, and to promote the exercise of every Christian virtue amongst men.

SCOTLAND.—OPENING OF THE CHAPEL OF ST. COLUMBA, MORVEN, ARGYLLSHIRE.—To Catholics, who could never visit the ruins of Iona without mourning over the devastations of the 'Reformation,' it must afford infinite gratification to learn, that, on the shore of Morven, and almost within sight of the ancient sanctuary of Iona, the torch of faith has again begun to shed her hallowing beams. On his estate of Drimnin, Sir Charles Gordon has, at his own expense, erected a chapel, not merely for his own family and such of his tenants as are Catholics, but sufficient also for the accommodation of all the Catholics at present in the districts of Morven and Mull.

This edifice was first opened for divine worship on Sunday the 9th of September, 1838. The solemn ceremony of benediction, as prescribed by the church, was performed by the Right Rev. Dr. Scott, the Vicar Apostolic of the District. The Right Rev. Dr. Carruthers, Vicar Apostolic of the Eastern District, assisted by the Rev. Messrs. William Gordon and A. M'Donald, celebrated the principal mass. Mr. Gordon preached a beautiful impressive opening sermon from 1 Machabees iv. 36, *et seq.*

The chapel was crowded by a most respectable assemblage from Tobermory and other places, many of whom were Protestants, whose attention to the whole service was most close and edifying.

FRANCE.—THE Seminary of Foreign Missions are about to send out two missionaries, Messrs. Gailhot and Chevalier, for Pondichery.

The minister of worship has granted 15,000 francs to assist the ecclesiastics in their functions, and the former religious of the diocese of Ajaccio.

The Royal Council of Public Instruction, by decree of the 13th of July last, have ordered the following class books in the colleges of Paris and academies of the kingdom. In the sixth form, the Gospels of the Sunday in Latin; the Manners of the Israelites and of the Christians by Fleury, with Selections from Fenelon. In the fourth, the New Testament in Greek and the poem of 'Religion.' In the third, St. Enke's Gospel in Greek Extracts from the Greek Holy Fathers, and the Petit Careme of Massillon. In the second, Bossuet's Universal History. In the first, The Acts of the Apostles in Greek, with Bossuet's and Flechier's Funeral Orations.

Printed by Messrs. W. Rushton and Co., for the Proprietors. Price one rupee per month, or ten rupees per annum in advance.

THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

‘One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.’

NO. VI.

AUGUST 10, 1839.

VOL. I.

This is true liberty ; when free-born men,
Having to advise the public, may speak out.

MILTON.

The Catholic Church so clearly traces her origin up to her Divine Founder, counts in her line of descent so many mighty nations and kings, and displays along her bright lineage so illustrious a succession of men distinguished for learning and sanctity, that even our unpretending journal, which has gone forth to defend and uphold her cause, blushes on its front, and shrinks up in alarm at the bare supposition of the least ignobleness in its birth. While therefore we thank the *Englishman* for the ‘discharge of his duty’ in noticing our new paper; while we laud even his conduct in ‘not recommending it to the public;’ (for what praise can a prophane journal bestow on a religious publication?), yet we cannot forbear harbouring resentment against him for asserting, that ‘the *Bengal Catholic Expositor* is born of the hostility of the *Calcutta Christian Advocate*.’ We should deem it anything but an honour to have the *Calcutta Christian Advocate* itself palmed upon us as a parent; but to say that we are the offspring of the HOSTILITY of such a paper, is to degrade us to the lowest sink of debase-ment. Knowing the *Englishman*’s playful genius that loves to sport wantonly with a metaphor, we should be inclined to affix a gentler meaning to his figurative expression, and to suppose that he meant by it no more than what is strictly true; viz. that the *Catholic Expositor*, which had been conceived some months before, burst into day, sooner than was expected, on account of a sudden terror, caused by the unprovoked hostility of the *Advocate*. But we are forbidden to judge so by the manner in which he follows up his idea: for he supposes our paper must needs inherit the fierce qualities of the hateful monster, which he has graciously assigned as its father, and that, ‘taking its origin in the illiberality and injustice of a hostile paper, it is only calculated’ (by being, we presume, necessarily illiberal and unjust in return) ‘to foment and perpetuate religious strife.’ Is it then wrong to defend one’s principles when unjustly assailed? Must we patiently sit down under calumny without making the least effort to remove it! Shall the voice of Truth, when error raises an outcry against her, be for ever hushed, lest religious strife may ensue? Does then the *Englishman* think, that

M

on the subject of religion alone it is illiberal and unjust, to stand up against illiberality and injustice? When a false insinuation, however slight, has been cast on his character, he is as quick in expressing as in feeling resentment. A torrent of proud and indignant invective pours along the columns of his journal. Whilst his own character is held so precious that it must not for a moment have the least stain upon it, yet it seems that the character of a large community is in his eyes of so little consequence and value, that it ought to be calumniated *with impunity*, and that the journal which justly defends, and the journal which unjustly attacks, ought at once to be consigned to the 'Tomb of the Capulets.' This indeed, could not be too soon the fate of both, if both were equally stamped with illiberality and injustice. But such shall never be the character of the *Bengal Catholic Expositor*. If he had expressed a hope that they would speedily go out of the world in the same order in which they had come into it, we should have perceived in him a sense of justice, though we might not discern a zeal for religion. Yet religion is a subject, which carries with it a deeper interest, and comes home more to the heart of every individual, than any of the topics which fill the columns of a newspaper; for, the latter regard the earthly concerns, either of individuals or of classes of men, whilst the former affects the eternal interests of the whole human race. It is pleasing, however, to reflect, that the sentiments at least of the Catholic community do not accord with those of the *Englishman*, and that the *Expositor*, though devoid of his recommendation, meets with the most ample and generous support. This does honor not only to their piety but to their understanding; for they now see clearly, that, without a journal of their own, there would be little chance of their being able to vindicate the aspersed character of their faith, when a newspaper, professing the most liberal sentiments, not only closes its columns (which is not improper) against discussions on religion, but condemns even a journal exclusively established for the purpose.

We beg to draw the attention of our readers to an account of the conversion of THE HON. MR. SPENCER, written by himself and published in the *Catholic Magazine* for April last. It is, no doubt, generally known, that the Reverend Convert is brother to Earl Spencer, late Lord Althorpe. When we consider his family influence, and the high respect in which his talents and character were held, we feel warranted in saying, that he not only relinquished a valuable benefice, but also the almost certain prospect of an English Mitre, in order to embrace the Catholic Faith. Who can but admire such heroic sacrifices to the cause of *Truth*!

ON RELIGIOUS KNIGHT-ERRANTRY.

Wilt thou tell a monstrous lie,
Being but half a fish and half a monster?

TEMPEST.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—It was most unfair and quite contrary to the laws of chivalry for Saint Dunstan, in his battle with the Devil, to seize the Arch-enemy by the nose with a pair of tongs. But his Satanic Majesty has at length determined to revenge the outrage. Accordingly, choosing the Com-

pound-Religion Knight as his champion, and arming him with those black Erybean weapons of which he is said to be the *father* and inventor, he has ordered him to sally forth and fight against you, Mr. Editor, whom he rightly judges to be a true son of Saint Dunstán. See then the Hydra-headed hero as he comes, mounted on a long-eared ass,* and flourishing in his hand a long pair of Kitchen-tongs,† with which he threatens to pull you along by the nose, as soon as he has got you in his grip. But be not terrified, Mr. Editor. As for the ass, I have often seen him and laughed at him before. He is now grown very old, his ears are become very long, and he has carried in his time many a Knight-errant equipped and sent forth by the Black Prince of Pandemonium. But, before my credulous many-helmeted Knight thought proper to get astride his back, never did I see him so suitably and characteristically mounted. In the huge 'tongs,' there is something new indeed, but nothing which ought to alarm you. For if you regard them attentively, you will find that they are a mere shadow, wrought out of some wreaths of black smoke in the smithy below. If they be made of more substantial metal, let him adduce the Pontifical Patent in Latin. If he has not one at hand, it will be as easy for him, as it was for McGee, to forge a big Latin Bull: which solemnly read in the Town-Hall to an astonished audience, will form a glorious counterpart to the scene at Exeter-Hall, and lead to the utter destruction of Popery. However, at a hasty glance, I confess, there is something formidable in the phantom of the 'tongs.' Look at it as it appears in No. 12 of the C. C. A.—A Popish priest standing three yards from a cholera-victim's bed, holding in his outstretched hands a huge pair of kitchen-fire tongs, and administering with it the sacrament to the dying patient!!! It is true that in the *translated* Patent the instrument is denominated 'tongs;' but 'tongs' may be 'kitchen fire-tongs:' which, in fact, they seem to be to the fancy: for the longer they are, the better for the purpose of reaching. How formidable! How dreadful!—Ha! ha! ha!—This is a good one however! Bravo! my many-headed Knight of the Black Spur! Mounted on your gallant long-eared steed, and couching the long lance of your Kitchen-tongs, I advise you Quixote-like to make another desperate charge at the rock-built church more solid than 'the windmills.' But no! I will show my Religious Knight-errant (for I love to encourage his chivalrous spirit) a less solid and more vulnerable foe.

A few years ago, when the cholera, like a blue-meagre scare-crow, made its appearance in Dublin, all the Parson-black Rooks with loud caws fled to their country villas, whilst the Catholic priests keeping fearlessly their ground, as well as the Sisters of Charity, (whom the *Quarterly Review* could not forbear styling 'Divine Saints,') were to be seen, at every hour, day and night, tending the sick bed in the discharge of their

* See No. 12 of Calcutta Christian Advocate. 'On the feast of the Ass.' This story divested of its Protestant decorations, is a common joke among Catholics. Yet, if some ignorant rustic parishioners ever did lead an ass in procession, what has that to do with the Catholic Church, which always condemned such extravagances? After all, the simple piety of the peasants in honor of a mystery of our Saviour's life is better than the Protestant want of it.

† See Do. 'On the Pope's order to administer the blessed Eucharist with tongs.' In contagious distempers, it is the usage of the Catholic Church to administer *extreme unction* with a small silver instrument, not the *Eucharist*, which requires no contact. If this sacrament be in any case given otherwise than with the hand, it is with a silver tea spoon.

sacred duties. The laugh ran hard, or indignation rose high, just as it chanced, against the poor parsons. Dr. Whaitley, the Protestant Pope of Dublin, who had brought himself into notice by a very excellent treatise on Logic, wrote a very grave and logical pamphlet in defence of his scarified runaway Under-shepherds; in which he proved to a demonstration not that it was their duty to attend the cholera-victims, but that it was their duty *not* to attend them: 1st, because, in so doing, there was great danger of catching the infection and bringing it into the bosom of their families: 2d, They could do very little good or none at all to those who were attacked, *since men die as they live*. This pamphlet instead of allaying; only encreased the outcry against the parsons.

For my part, I thought the Doctor's conclusion drawn with logical accuracy from his premises—the leading tenets of the Protestant religion—and not judged how admirable, useful and worthy of rich support must that church be, which can give no help to a man just when he most stands in need of it. I can see no reason in the world, why in such cases a parson should expose himself to death, and his family either to death or destitution; imminent risk for no advantage. As for a Catholic priest, it is a different matter with him altogether. Let him rush into the midst of infection as often as the dying may choose to call him. Who cares for him? On the one hand he can render essential benefit in *praying over the sick man and in anointing him with oil, because the prayer of faith will save the sick man*; and, on the other, having neither wife nor children, he entails, if he fall, no evil on his family. Now, my many-helmed knight, if you unlike me, have a mind to quarrel with the parsons, dash on them at full gallop, and spear them with your kitchen-tongs; for Don Quixote made a good attack on a herd of sheep, and you, I doubt not, will make a successful charge on a drove of shepherds. If victory sit on your helms, I will then point out to you an enemy truly worthy of your chivalrous valour,—a phantom, a mighty shadow, a giant figure of a foe.

A man, seized with an infectious disorder, sent for the parson: who could not be prevailed on to attend until he had a promise of a piece of gold as a compensation for the danger to which he exposed himself. As soon as he entered the sick man's chamber, he began without delay to read the usual service, but took care all the time to keep himself at a very respectful distance from the bed. Having got through the preparatory prayers, he took out the bread and wine which he had brought with him, and thus addressing the patient: 'You know, my good brother,' said he, (pointing to the elements) that in eating this bread and drinking this wine, you will verily and indeed that is, *figuratively* eat and drink the body and blood of the Lord. Do you believe?' 'Yes,' answered the sick man. 'That's well,' said the minister, who now began to tremble and grow pale as it became necessary for him to draw close to the bed-side, 'that's well;' but, recollecting himself, 'you have eaten and drunk bread and wine before, have you not?' 'Very often.' 'Enough,' replied the Man of God: 'every thing here is done and obtained by faith, which the outward elements serve only to awaken. Call then to mind with lively faith, that you *have* eaten and drunk bread and wine, and you will verily and indeed, that is, *figuratively*, eat and drink the body and blood of the Lord.' Upon that the minister retired, congratulating himself on his fortunate escape. Some time after he chanced to meet in the public road his

patient, who had recovered from his sickness and was taking the morning air. Ha! cried the minister, 'are you alive? I am glad to see you.—By-the-bye, you owe me a guinea?' 'I do,' said the convalescent, putting his hand into his pocket and taking out a gold coin, and I shall be most happy to pay you as you deserve. What is this?'—holding up the coin between his fore-finger and thumb? 'A guinea,' answered the chuckling wistful-eyed man of the other world. 'Have you ever received one before,' demanded the convalescent? 'Oh! the shadow of one has often darkened the door of my pocket.' Believe then,' said the other, 'that you *have* received a guinea, and you will now *figuratively* receive one.' So saying, he put the money into his pocket, and bowing to his clerical friend, took leave of him. Now, my gallant knight of the long-eared steed, here is a big monster of a *FIGURE*, which if you will attack and destroy, you will render the most signal service to suffering christianity. But I fear you in this! For there is something in a monster so congenial with your nature, that, at the sight of one, you are more ready to hug it as a friend than to grapple with it as a foe.

But, Mr. Editor, (for it is now time to drop my addresses to my knight-errant of religion,) there are certain points in his creed (I speak frankly) which I should like well enough, if I could bring myself to believe them true. Oh! with the sole bible as my rule and private spirit as my interpreter, I would make fine work of religion. I would pay no taxes and obey no authority, like John of Munster, and all by the Gospel of Saint Matthew. I would take unto myself at least two wives according to Saint Luke, and prove it quite lawful, as Luther did to his Patron Prince, by the holy examples of Abraham, Jacob, David, and Solomon. I would get drunk—I have a strong dash in me of old Stephano the drunken butler's propensity—I would get drunk, I say, by the Epistles of Saint Paul. How so? you will ask. Why, observe. My worthy knight of the 'Long Tongs' explains these scriptural phrases; '*My flesh is meat indeed and my blood is drink indeed*,' in this manner, 'My flesh is NOT meat indeed, but figuratively, and my blood is NOT drink indeed, but figuratively. Again he interprets the words. *This is my body—this is my blood*' by 'this is NOT my body, but a *FIGURE* of it—this is NOT my blood but a *FIGURE* of it. Now, Mr. Editor, if the word NOT be of so very little import, that my knight of the 'Black Spur' can put it in where he likes, I see no reason, if you do not, why I may not strike it out where I like: so where Saint Paul says, '*Drunkards shall not inherit the kingdom of heaven*,' by just dropping that useless word *not*, I shall have, 'Drunkards shall inherit the kingdom of heaven! Then Oh! the bright days I shall see! Here happily *glorious* and hereafter gloriously happy! But it wo'nt do! I know it. I must, to be saved, stick to the old Popish doctrine of abstinence. I dare not leave our good but inflexible old mother the Catholic Church. I am terrified, I confess it, at the sight of that undefined, shapeless, gigantic *FIGURE*; and I am sure, if my religious knight-errant, bold as he is, fond as he is of a monster—were to see that frightful *THING* standing full in his faces, as he goes along some lonely path in quest of adventure, he would in a moment rein up his long-eared charger, unclasp all his helmets, scratch all his heads and stare with all his eyes, puzzled and perplexed what to make of or what to do with a *FIGURE* SO MONSTROUS.

STEPHANO.

THE ADVOCATE'S DEFINITION OF THE TRUE CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—The *Advocate* of last Saturday has occupied six of his columns in demonstrating a proposition, which is stated in these words: 'Popery not the True Church, and unchangeable in its nature and spirit,' agreeably to the rules of Logic he proceeds in the first place to define, what he calls the True Church, 'the Church of the Living God, built upon the Apostles and Prophets; Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone.' This is a very rational method of proceeding; and, when I had read so far, I thought that the *Advocate* was at last in earnest, and had come to the charge with a right good will. But great was my surprise to find, that there was not a single argument throughout the whole article, which tended in the least to prove the proposition at the head of it.

The only sentiment which the perusal of this article gave rise to was, that if the definition of the True Church of Christ, given in it be conformable to the idea which the author has, of it, and if he will not change it in a few days, there was not the least utility in the publication of the *Advocate*, so far as it be the means of converting Catholics. The Church is thus defined, 'a simple, spiritual, holy brotherhood, loving the Lord their God with all their heart and mind, &c. and their neighbours as themselves; seeking by every spiritual means to spread abroad the knowledge of Christ to all mankind, &c.' 'such,' says the *Advocate*, the Church of Christ, 'will be found to have been in all ages under whatever system it has been veiled; for, it has been, in all Christian systems more or less, according to their assimilation to the word of God.' Now, Sir, I believe, it will be allowed, that the Catholic system is a Christian system; and the Catholic Church, in spite of all that her enemies have alleged against her on this head, has always held and does hold charity to be a sovereign virtue, a virtue which not only binds in unity her members on earth, but joins them in fellowship with the blessed in heaven. The Catholic Church unquestionably spreads the knowledge of Christ; for in what part of the globe, among what people, has she not carried the glad tidings of the Gospel; even the *Advocate* asserts, that 'it exists but to propagate itself.' The Catholic Church then possesses the distinctive marks of the true Church, even according to the definition given of it by the *Advocate*; what need therefore of further dispute? This is a simple conclusion, and will appear a just one to every well-informed and unprejudiced reader.

But the difficulty of convincing a Protestant, such as the *Advocate*, who is resolved at any hazard to condemn the Catholic doctrine as uncharitable and bigoted, is not so easily removed. These personages belong to that class of disputatants who have been likened to the enchanter in the romance, who though his head be cut off claps it on his shoulders again and returns to the charge as fresh as ever. Although it has been a thousand times demonstrated in the most clear and unequivocal manner from texts of Scripture, that the doctrines of the Catholic Church are conformable to holy writ, yet these doctrines have been repeatedly distorted into idolatry, superstition, and uncharitableness; and the Catholic Church has been charged with these crimes in spite of the decrees of her councils and her

catechisms, and books of instruction, which declare that she abhors them. The *Advocate*, true to his sect (by *his sect*, I mean the enemies of the Catholic Church, for he befriends no particular religious sect) has adopted this course, and taking for granted that the Catholic Church pays divine honor to the Pope, that she teaches her children to persecute and destroy Christians, that she denounces the Bible as mischievous, that she has set up an endless retinue of Saints as mediators between God and man, &c. Most triumphantly concludes that the Church of Rome, is not the True Church. Admirable reasoning ! Grant but the premises, the conclusion is inevitable. But what unbiased mind will grant such premises.

In proof of the want of charity of the Catholic Church and its persecuting spirit, the *Advocate* adduces the massacres of St. Bartholomew, of the Waldenses, the acts of the Jesuits, the Inquisition, &c. most of the stories on such subjects are evidently gross exaggerations, they bear the stamp of falsehood on their face, witness the absurdities with which that popular Protestant work 'Fox's Book of Martyrs' is filled. But granting the worst, what are they but the overflowings of the bad passions of men, perhaps ignorant unprincipled men, which no religion could have repressed ? Is it reasonable to conclude from the treachery of Judas, one of the twelve chosen of the Lord, that he that was truth itself had preached falsehood ?

When it is considered that the Catholic Religion has existed for eighteen hundred years, and that during by much the greater part of this long period of time ignorance and barbarism had darkened the earth, the wonder should be, not that there have been so many, but so few enormities. But we can return the blow in kind, and with better grace too. It is but three hundred years, since Protestantism took its birth, and has spread over but a small portion of the world, yet the crimes committed by the followers of it exceed by far, in proportion, those ascribed to Catholics. Let the *Advocate* consult his favorite Robertson, and see what is said by him of the violent, cruel, and rebellious conduct of the Anabaptists. Did not the reformation, as it is called, feed and grow on rebellion and warfare ? Did not Luther, the father of the Protestant Church, publish rebellious pamphlets and excite the people of Germany to take up arms against their lawful sovereigns ? The violent and acrimonious nature of these publications will be better understood from the following quotation in Bossuet's History of the variations of the Protestant Churches. He compared the Pope to a Mad Wolf, 'against whom the whole world takes up arms at the first signal without waiting for commands from the magistrate. And, if after he has been shut up in an enclosure, the magistrate sets him at liberty, you may continue,' said he, 'to pursue this savage beast, and *with impunity attack those, who prevented his destruction*. If you fall in the engagement before the beast has received its mortal wound, you have but one thing only to repent of, that you did not bury your dagger in its breast. This is the way to deal with the Pope. *All those who defend him, must also be treated like a band of robbers under their Captain, be they Kings, be they Caesars.*' Look again at Britain, the strong-hold of Protestantism, what cruelties have not been practised there. In the reign of Queen Elizabeth how many martyrs have been burnt at the stake, how many have shed their blood at the block, or been broke on the rack ! Campion and his followers are memorable instances. Then again, the Star Chamber instituted about the same time, what

was it but the inquisition, and that in its worst features. Even in later times how miserably have the Irish Catholics been oppressed and so late as the middle of the last century, a reward was given to any who brought the head of a Catholic Priest.

Protestantism in power is not very forbearing. Catholics alone are not the objects of its cruelty; its different sects trample on each other, the Dissenters have felt the oppression of the Church of England. Let me not be misunderstood. I do not adduce these acts of cruelty practised by Protestants as an argument against their doctrine, my purpose is only to shew that Catholics have not been singular in this respect, and how unreasonable it is to impugn the doctrines of any sect because a few of its members, intoxicated by license and power, have acted against the principles which they profess.

29th July 1839.

X.

P. S.—The *Advocate* says, 'Popery exists but to propagate itself and destroy the work of the Reformation.' Is it not the nature and doctrine of Christianity in every form to propagate itself? As 'for destroying the work of the reformation,' that is but the consequence of its propagation of itself, and is it not the purpose of the Reformation to destroy the Catholic Church?

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS—CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—Your cotemporary of the *Advocate* has in his last issue given a prominent place to the following opinion from the *Oriental Christian Spectator* for June 1839:—

'This (the *Christian Advocate*) is a paper conducted on the SOUNDDEST RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLES, which we strongly recommend to the notice of our readers.'

Without stopping to enquire whether the *Christian Spectator* means to commend the misrepresentations and abuses with which his hebdomadal brother of the *Advocate* has so unsparingly lavished on the *Catholic Church*, I beg leave to draw the reader's attention to an editorial of the *Englishman* of the 1st July last, the *very day* on which the *Christian Spectator* for June, was published.

After talking of the '*canting pretences*' of certain journals and of 'the *endless schemes*, of the *pseudo-religious* and professedly *Christian*, for *extracting money* from people's pockets under the *pretence* of forming institutions and maintaining societies, 'which, if not noticed by the leading journals' are attacked in such a way as to cause displeasure, the editor of the *Englishman* states, that

'We will not go back to other journals to illustrate our remarks, but simply quote a passage from the *Christian Advocate* of Saturday, which, for IMPUDENCE and FALSEHOOD, (we are sorry to be obliged to use the words) *exceeds* any thing of the kind we have ever met with in any paper *not* calling itself, '*Christian*!'

I need not quote the passage but give the further opinion of the *Englishman*.:—

'The allegation of the *Christian Advocate* is a *foul libel* which nothing but the vexation and disappointment of *unnoticed mediocrity* can explain, or the *wildness of fanaticism* even partially excuse. The *Friend of India*, whom we offer to the *Christian Advocate* as a model, never exhibited this *vulgar impatience of patronage*; but made its way by the force of its own merit and by its *Christian bearing* towards its cotemporary.'

Now, Mr. Editor, may I ask, which of the opinions of the two Protestant authorities (*The Observer* and the *Englishman*) is to be accredited? How can the *Christian Advocate* be 'conducted on the *soundest religious principles*' if, for *impudence* and *falsehood* it exceeds any thing of the kind, the editor of the *Englishman* 'ever met with in any paper not calling himself *Christian*'?

AU REVOIR!

Selections.

A SHORT ACCOUNT OF THE CONVERSION OF THE HONORABLE AND REVEREND GEORGE SPENCER TO THE CATHOLIC FAITH.

(Written in the English College at Rome, in the year 1831.)

[The following account, with the original MS. of which, we have been kindly favoured by Mr. Spencer, was written by the Honourable and Reverend Gentleman at the request of the Bishop of Oppido, a small town at the lowest extremity of Italy, who had come to Rome to pay homage to the present Pope, then recently elected. In that retired spot, Catholic charity had excited an interest about his conversion among the flock of this excellent Prelate; and to satisfy their feelings the Bishop visited the English College, and requested Mr. Spencer to write him some details of it for the use of his people, as they had received a bare report only of the fact. The MS. was translated into Italian by Dr. Gentili, now Professor at Prior Park.]

I took orders in the Protestant Episcopal Church of England, Dec. 22nd, 1822, and for seven years I had the care of a parish containing about eight hundred inhabitants, in which is situated my father's principal residence. I never was very bigotted in my attachment to the doctrines and discipline of the Church of England, but seeing no cause to doubt of their being truly in agreement with the word of God, I was from the beginning of my ministry desirous of bringing back into communion with her those Protestant sectaries, who, under various denominations, had separated from her; and I used to have frequent discussions with such as were to be met with in my neighbourhood, and particularly in my own parish. The chief of these were Methodists, Baptists, and Independents. The more I spoke with them, the more persuaded I was, that the principles on which they defended their separation from the Church, were unsound; but when I began to attend with candour to what they had to say, I hardly had a conversation with any of them, which did not show me more clearly than before, that the Church of England herself yet needed improvement and correction.

The professed fundamental principle of all protestants is to adhere to the Scriptures as the only rule of faith and morals. I soon discovered that in the constitution of the Church of England there were many things which I could not clearly defend by the simple Scriptures; but these generally were points to which I was not required to declare my direct consent; they seemed matters of discipline; but at last I found a difficulty in one of the Thirty-nine Articles of religion, to which all the clergy are to subscribe, which I could not fairly answer, and on account of which I determined that I would never subscribe to them again. This was the eighth Article; in which I found myself called up-

on to affirm that the three Creeds, received by the Church of England, *i. e.* the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian, might be clearly proved by Scripture. I had some years before had scruples about the condemning clauses in the Athanasian Creed; but I had been satisfied again by reading what the Protestant divines had to say in defence and explanation of them. My scruples returned after a sermon which I preached on Trinity Sunday, 1827, in defence of that very creed. I observed that the arguments by which I defended the doctrine of the Trinity itself were indeed founded on Scripture, but that in attempting to prove to my hearers that a belief of this doctrine was absolutely necessary for man's salvation, I had recourse to arguments independent of Scripture, and that no passage in Scripture could be found which declares, that whosoever will be saved must hold the orthodox faith on the Trinity. I had this difficulty on my mind for eight or nine months; after which, finding that I could not satisfy myself upon it, I gave notice to my superiors, that I could not conscientiously declare my full assent to the Thirty-ninth Articles. They attempted, at first, to satisfy me by arguments, but the more I discussed the subject, the more convinced I became that the article in question was not defensible, and after fifteen months' farther pause, I made up my mind to leave off reading the Creed in the service of my Church, and informed my Bishop of my final resolution. Of course he might have taken measures to oblige me to resign my benefice; but he thought it more prudent to take no notice of my letter, and thus I remained in possession of my place, till I embraced the Catholic Faith.

The point on which I thus found myself opposed to the Church of England appears a trifling one; but here was enough to hinder all my prospects of advancement; and to put it in the power of the Bishop, if at any time he had chosen to do so, to call on me to give up my benefice. It is easy to conceive that, under these circumstances, my mind was set free, beyond what could be imagined in any other way, to follow without prejudice my researches after truth. I lost no opportunity of discoursing with ministers of all persuasions. I called upon them all to join with me in the enquiry where was the truth, which could be but one, and therefore could be in any two contrary systems of religion; much less in all the variety of sects into which Christians are divided in England. I found little encouragement in any quarter to this way of proceeding, at least, among Protestants. Those sectarians of a contrary persuasion to myself, to whom I proposed an inquiry with me after truth, I found generally ready to speak with me; but they did not even pretend to have any disposition to examine the grounds of their own principles, which they were determined to abide by without farther hesitation. My bretheren of the Established Church equally declined joining me in my discussions with persons of other persuasions, and disapproved of my pursuit, saying, that I should never convert them to our side, and that I only ran the risk of being shaken myself. Their objections only excited me to greater diligence. I considered that if what I held were truth, charity required that I should never give over my attempt to bring others into the same way, though I were to labour all my life in vain. If, on the contrary, I was in any degree of error, the sooner I was shaken in it the better. I was convinced by the numberless exhortations of St. Paul to his disciples, that they should be of one mind, and have no divisions; that the object which I had before me, that is the re-union of the differing bodies of Christians, was pleasing to God, and I had full confidence that I was in no danger of being led into error, or suffering any harm in following it up, as long as I studied nothing but to do the will of God in it, and trusted to his Holy Spirit to direct me.

The result of all these discussions with different sects of Protestants, was a conviction that no one of us had a correct view of Christianity. We all appeared right thus far, in acknowledging Christ as the Son of God, whose doctrines and commandments we were to follow as the way to happiness, both in time and eternity; but it seemed as if the form of doctrines and discipline established by the Apostles, had been lost sight of all through the church. I wished therefore to see Christians in general united in the resolution to find

the way of truth and peace, convinced that God would not fail to point it out to them. Whether or not others would seek this blessing with me, I had great confidence that before long, God would clear up my doubts, and therefore my mind was not made uneasy by them. I must here notice a conversation which I had with a Protestant minister about a year before I was a Catholic, by which my views of the use of the Scriptures were much enlightened, and by which, as it will be clearly seen, I was yet farther prepared to come to a right understanding of the true rule of Christian Faith, proposed by the Catholic Church. This gentleman was a zealous defender of the authority of the Church of England, against the various sects of Protestant Dissenters, who have of late years gained so much advantage against her. He perceived that while men were allowed to claim a right of interpreting the Scriptures, according to their own judgment, there never could be an end of schisms; and therefore he zealously insisted on the duty of our submitting to ecclesiastical authority in controversies of faith, maintaining that the Spirit of God spoke to us through the voice of the Church, as well as in the written Word. Had I been convinced by this part of his argument, it would have led me to submit to the Catholic Church, and not to the Church of England; and, indeed, I am acquainted with one young man who actually became a Catholic through the preaching of this gentleman—following these true principles, as he was bound to do, to their legitimate consequences. But I did not, at this time, perceive the truth of the position; I yet had no idea of the existence of Divine unwritten Tradition in the Church. I could imagine no way for the discovery of the truth, but persevering study of the Scriptures, which, as they were the only Divine rule of faith, with which I was acquainted, I thought must of course be sufficient for our guidance, if used with an humble and tractable spirit; but the discourse of this clergyman led me at least to make an observation which had never struck by mind before, as being of any importance,—namely, that the system of religion, which Christ taught the apostles, and which they delivered to the Church, was something distinct from our volume of the Scriptures. The New Testament, I perceived to be a collection of accidental writings, which, as coming from the pens of inspired men, I was assured must, in every point, be agreeable to the true faith; but they neither were, nor anywhere professed to be, a complete and systematic account of Christian faith and practice. I was therefore in want of some farther guidance on which I could depend. I knew not that it was in the Catholic Church that I was at length to find what I was in search of, but every Catholic will see, if I have sufficiently explained my case, how well I was prepared to accept with joy the direction of the Catholic Church, when once I should be convinced, that she still preserved unchanged and inviolate the very form of faith taught by the Apostles, the knowledge of which is, as it were, the key to the right and sure interpretation of the written Word.

It is now time, then, to set the principal steps by which it pleased God gradually to overcome my prejudices against the Catholic Church. In my early education I heard very little about the Catholic Church. I had been taught, in general terms, that it was full of errors and superstitions; that at the glorious era of the Reformation, Luther had begun the work of dispelling the darkness with which the spiritual tyranny of the Popes had covered the world; and that England was one of the favoured nations which had shaken off the yoke, and had adopted the most admirable system of faith and worship of any of the Reformed Churches. This is the general statement of the case, which has been handed down from father to son, since the days of Queen Elizabeth. If it be asked how people can suffer themselves to be so imposed upon, I can only answer, that men will readily believe what flatters their personal or their national vanity, and therefore the English have received this tale with ready credulity; and hardly one in a thousand stops to doubt what comes confirmed by such weight of authority, and what he naturally desires to be true. As it was under these impression that I looked on what I saw of the Catholic reli-

gion, when I was in Italy ten or twelve years ago, it is no wonder that I went home only confirmed in my prejudices.

After I had taken orders, I began to make theology a study; I read some Protestant Commentaries on the Apocalypse, applying to what are called the errors of Popery what is there revealed of the great defection from the truth to take place in the latter days; and I put it down for certain that in whatever body of men the truth was to be found, the last place to seek it in was among the Catholics. Protestants, in general, would consider Catholics not only as misguided, but as incorrigible in their errors; and if any of them should entertain the thought of a future healing of the divisions of the Church, and its re-establishment as one united body, they would not look forward to this being to take place by the return of Protestants within the pale of the Catholic Church, after a reformation of her abuses. Their idea is, that God's people must come out from her; that she is prefigured by the spiritual Babylon, and that her end is not to be corrected, but utterly destroyed.

At one time, perhaps, I should have assented to principles like these, but I did not hold them long, when I began to think for myself. The first circumstance by which it pleased God in some degree to open my eyes, was a correspondence into which I entered with a person who withheld his name, but who professed to be a young man of the Protestant Church, who had been some time in a Catholic town abroad, where conversations he had had with some Catholics, and his observation of their worship and character, had led him to doubt the truth of what he had been taught in his childhood about Popery and the Reformation. He professed to be under great suspense and misery, and entreated me, as a well-informed Protestant, to satisfy him on a few questions which he proposed. I entered with joy on this correspondence, which continued for six months. I expected easily to convince him that the Catholic Church was full of errors; but he answered my arguments, and I perceived that he became more and more disposed to join it. I discovered, by means of this correspondence, that I had never duly considered the principles of our Reformation; that my objections to the Catholic Church were prejudices adopted from the sayings of others, not the result of my own observation. Instead of gaining the advantage in this controversy, I saw, and I owned to my correspondent, that a great change had been produced in myself. I no longer desired to persuade him to keep in the communion of the Protestant Church; but rather determined and promised to follow up the same enquiries with him, if he would make his name known to me, and only pause awhile before he joined the Catholics. But I heard no more of him till after my conversion and arrival at Rome, when I discovered that my correspondent was a lady, who had herself been converted a short time before she wrote to me. I never had heard her name before, nor am I aware that she had ever seen my person; but God moved her to desire and pray for my salvation, which she also undertook to bring about in the way I have related. I cannot say that I entirely approve of the stratagem to which she had recourse; but her motive was good, and God gave success to her attempt; for it was this which first directed my attention particularly to inquire about the Catholic religion; though she lived not to know the accomplishment of her wishes and prayers. She died at Paris a year before my conversion, when about to take the veil as a nun of the Sacred Heart; and I trust I have in her an intercessor in Heaven, as she prayed for me so fervently on earth.

After this period, I entertained the opinion that the Reformers had done wrong in separating from the original body of the Church; at any rate I was convinced that Protestants who succeeded them were bound to make attempts at a re-union with it. I am still convinced that many errors and corruptions had been introduced among Catholics, and I did not imagine that I could ever conform to their faith, or join in all their practices, without some alterations on their part; but I trusted that the time might not be distant, when God would in spire all Christians with a spirit of peace and concord, which would make Protestants anxiously seek to be reunited to their brethren; and Catho-

lies, willing to listen to reason and to correct those abuses in faith and discipline, which kept their brethren from joining them. To the procuring such a happy termination to the miserable schisms which had rent the Church, I determined to devote my life. I now lost no opportunity of conversation with Protestants or Catholics. My object with both was to awaken them to a desire of unity with each other; to satisfy myself more clearly where was the exact path of truth in which it was desirable that we should all walk together; and then to persuade all to correct their respective errors, in conformity with the perfect rule, which I had no doubt the Lord would in due time point out to me, and to all who were ready to follow his will disinterestedly. I thought that when Catholics were at length willing to enter with me on these discussions with candour, they would at once begin to see the errors, which to me appeared so palpable in their system; but I was greatly surprised to find them all so fixed in their principles, that they gave me no prospect of re-union, except on condition of others submitting unreservedly to them; and, at the same time I could see in their ordinary conduct and manner of disputing with me, nothing to make me suspect them of insincerity, or of want of sufficient information of the grounds of their belief. These repeated conversations increased more and more my desire to discover this true road, which I saw, that I, at least for one, was ignorant of; but I still imagined that I could see such plain marks of difference between the Catholic Church of the present day, and the Church of the primitive ages as described in Scripture, that I repeatedly put aside the impression which the arguments of Catholics, and yet more my observation of their character, made upon me, and I still held up my head in the controversy.

Near the end of the year 1829, I was introduced to young Mr. Phillips, eldest son of a rich gentleman of Leicestershire, whom I had often heard spoken of as a convert to the Catholic religion. I had for a long time been curious to see him that I might observe the mode of reasoning by which he had been persuaded into what I still thought so great an error. We spent five hours together in the house of the Rev. Mr. Foley, Catholic Missionary in my neighbourhood, with whom I had already had much intercourse. I was interested by the ardent zeal of this young man in the cause of his faith. I had previously imagined that he must have been ignorant on the subject of religion, and that he had suffered himself to be led blindly by others; but he answered all my objections about his own conversion with readiness and intelligence. I could not but see that it had been in him the result of his own diligent investigations. I was much delighted with what I could observe of his character. I was more than ever inflamed with a desire to be united in communion with persons in whom I saw such clear signs of the spirit of God; but yet my time was not fully come. I fancied by his conversation, that he had principles and ideas inconsistent with what I had learned from Scripture; and in a few days I again put aside the uneasiness which this meeting had occasioned, and continued to follow my former purpose, only with increased resolution to come at satisfaction. He was in the meanwhile much interested with my case. He recommended me to the prayers of some religious communities, and soon after invited me to his father's house, that he might continue our discourses. I was happy at the prospect of this meeting; and full of hopes that it would prove satisfactory to me; but I left home without any idea of the conclusion to which it pleased God to bring me so soon.

On Sunday, the 24th of January 1830, I preached in my church, and in the evening took leave of my family for the week, intending to return the Saturday following to my ordinary duties at home. But our Lord ordered better for me. During the week I spent on this visit, I passed many hours daily in conversations with Phillips, and was satisfied beyond all my expectations with the answers he gave me to the different questions I proposed about the principal tenets and practices of Catholics. During the week, we were in company with several other Protestants, and among them some distinguished clergymen of the Church of England, who occasionally joined in our discussions: I was

struck with observing how the advantage always appeared on his side, in the arguments which took place between them, notwithstanding their superior age and experience; and I saw how weak was the cause in behalf of which I had hitherto been engaged; I felt ashamed of arguing any longer against what I began to see clearly could not be fairly disproved. I now openly declared myself completely shaken, and though I determined to take no decided step till I was entirely convinced, I determined to give myself no rest till I was satisfied, and had little doubt now of what the result would be. But yet I thought not how soon God would make the truth clear to me. I was to return home, as I have said, on the Saturday. Philipps agreed to accompany me on the day previous to Leicester, where we might have farther conversation with Father Caestryck, the Catholic Missionary established in that place. I imagined that I might probably take some weeks longer for consideration. But Mr. Caestryck's conversation that afternoon overcame all my opposition. He explained to me and made me see that the way to come at the knowledge of true religion, is not to contend, as men are disposed to do, about each individual point, but to submit implicitly to the authority of Christ, and of those to whom he has committed the charge of his flock. He set before me the undeniable but wonderful fact of the agreement of the Catholic Church all over the world in one faith, under one head; he showed me that the assertions of Protestants that the Catholic Church had altered her doctrines, were not supported by evidence. He pointed out the wonderful unbroken chain of the Roman Pontiffs: he observed to me how in all ages the Church, under their guidance, had exercised an authority undisputed by their children, of cutting off from her communion all who opposed her faith and disobeyed her discipline. I saw that her assumption of this power was consistent with Christ's commission to his Apostles to teach all men to the end of the world, and his declaration that those who would not hear the pastors of his Church rejected him. What right then, thought I, had Luther and his companions to set themselves against the united voice of the Church? I saw that he rebelled against the authority of God, when he set himself up as an independent guide. He was bound to obey the Catholic Church: how should I then not be equally bound to return to it. And need I fear that I should be led into error, by trusting myself to those guides to whom Christ himself thus directed me? No! I thought this impossible. Full of these impressions, I left Mr. Caestryck's house to go to my inn, whence I was to return home next morning. Philipps accompanied me, and took this last occasion to impress on me the awful importance of the decision which I was called upon to make. At length I answered, 'I am overcome. There is no doubt of the truth: one more Sunday I will preach to my congregation, and then put myself into Mr. Foley's hands and conclude this business.'

It may be thought with what joyful ardour he embraced this declaration, and warned me to declare my sentiments faithfully in these my last discourses. The next minute led me to the reflection,—have I any right to stand on that pulpit, being once convinced that the Church is heretical to which it belongs? Am I safe in exposing myself to the danger which may attend one day's travelling, while I turn my back on the Church of God, which now calls me to unite himself to her for ever? I said to Philipps, if this step is right for me to take next week, it is my duty to make it now. My resolution is made; to-morrow I will be received into the Church. We lost no time in dispatching a messenger to my father, to inform him of this unexpected event: as I was forming my last resolution, the thought of him came across me: will it not be said, that I endanger his very life by so sudden and severe a shock? ought I not in deference and in tenderness towards him, at least, to go home and break it gently to him. The words of our Lord rose before me, and answered all my doubts: 'He that hateth not father and mother, and brothers, and sisters, and houses, and lands, and his own life, too, cannot be my disciple.' To the Lord, then, I trusted for the support and comfort of my dear father under the trial, which, in obedience to his call, I was about to

inflict upon him. I had no farther anxiety to disturb me: God alone knows the peace and joy with which I laid me down that night to rest. The next day, at nine o'clock, the Church received me for her child.

To this account given of my conversion, I need only add that I am now in the English College at Rome, studying for holy orders; and have already received the order of subdeacon. I had inquired after the truth, not only for my own sake, but for that of others, who already were looking or might hereafter look up to me for instruction; and my first wish, when the knowledge of it broke upon my mind, was to communicate to others what I had discovered, and persuade them to follow it with me. I proposed myself, therefore, to the Catholic Vicar Apostolic of the District in which I resided, as desirous of ordination, and would willingly have entered immediately on the work of a missionary. I was soon convinced, however, that God required of me to submit implicitly to the judgment of my superiors, and to leave myself at their disposal. In obedience to them I am in my present situation, where every new inquiry to which the course of my studies leads me, and every conversation I have with my Protestant brethren, whom I occasionally meet in this place, assure me more and more, that if there is a true religion upon earth, it is in the Catholic Church, and that in joining that Church, I have done what, if I live according to its holy precepts, insures to me in this life the possession of true peace of heart, and will lead to eternal happiness in the next.

DECLARATIONS OF THE CATHOLIC BISHOPS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

(Continued from No. 5, page 84.)

SECTION VII.

On the Obligation of an Oath.

Catholics are charged with holding that *they are not bound by any oath, and that the Pope can dispense them from all the oaths they may have taken.*

We cannot sufficiently express our astonishment at such a charge. We hold that the obligation of an oath is most sacred: for by an oath man calls the Almighty Searcher of Hearts to witness the sincerity of his conviction of the truth of what he asserts; and his fidelity in performing the engagement he makes. Hence, whosoever swears falsely, or violates the lawful engagement he has confirmed by an oath, not only offends against truth, or justice, but against religion. He is guilty of the enormous crime of perjury.

No power in any Pope, or council, or in any individual or body of men invested with authority in the Catholic Church, can make it lawful for a Catholic to confirm any falsehood by oath; or dispense with any oath by which a Catholic has confirmed his duty of allegiance to his sovereign, or any obligation of duty or justice to a third person. He who takes an oath is bound to observe it, in the obvious meaning of the words, or in the words, or in the known meaning of the person to whom it is sworn.

INTELLIGENCE.

ENGLAND.—NEW MISSION AT MARYPORT.—We are happy to record the establishment of a New Mission at the thriving little town of Maryport, on the west coast of Cumberland, to which the Rev. Richard Croft has recently been appointed; and, ere long, we trust that the erection of a more suitable and commodious place of worship will extend the sphere of his utility—cheer the pastor and his flock, and tend to the revival of the true faith.

HUDDERSFIELD.—The Rev. Mr. Trappes, of St. Patrick's chapel, in pursuance of public address to the inhabitants of Huddersfield, posted on the walls of the town, has delivered, every Sunday evening during Lent, a lecture on the doctrines of the Catholic church. This has caused great excitement, and the chapel has been well attended by Protestants, who showed much attention.

FLOWERS FROM THE HOLY FATHERS.
No. III.

(From the *Catholic Magazine*, for April 1838.)

Domine inquietum est cor meum, donec quiescat in te.—*Sti. Augustini.*

My heart ran wide o'er sea and earth,
I longed for rest and quiet peace,
I gave the reins to boundless thought;
I searched for it in noisy mirth,
I looked for rest in sensual ease—
I sought for it and found it not.

Soon as the airy phantom rose,
It melted from my gaze away;
It left me sad and troubled more:
Unseemly joy gave place to woes—
My sunshine grew a misty ray—
My brightest hopes were clouded o'er.

The deeper that I clung to earth,
The more I felt disquiet reign—
More gloom girt round my choicest glee:
For I the while was nursing death,
And hugging fast my iron chain,
Away, my God, from peace and thee.

The more I fled from Thee, my All,
More sunk the iron in my breast;
Thou wert my peace, and still I fled,
Deaf to the music of thy call—
Senseless to thine appeals of rest—
In seeming life as I were read.

Still thou didst press me, and didst give
A penance to upbraid and chafe,
Till I should melt before thy grace—
Till I should turn to Thee and life,
And find in Thee a harbour safe—
A refuge sure, and resting-place.

* Then didst thou give my heart increase
Of will and power, of love and light;
That like a mighty river flows,
Then did my heart recover peace;
And turning from a world's despite,
In thee, my God, found calm repose.

* 'Viam mandatorum tuorum cucurri, eam dilatasti cor meum.'—*Psalm cxviii.* 32.

Any profit which may arise from this publication, will be devoted to the Catholic Free Schools, at Calcutta.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor, care of Messrs. W. Rushton and Co.

Printed by Messrs. W. Rushton and Co., for the Proprietors, price one rupee per month, or ten rupees per annum in advance. To non-subscribers 8 annas per number.

THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

‘*One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.*’

NO. VII.

AUGUST 17, 1839.

VOL. I.

Without attempting to answer the clear train of reasoning which we have adopted, the *Christian Advocate* is pleased to grace it with the appellations of ‘quibbles, assumptions and fallacies,’ and without adducing the least corroborative testimony in support of facts, which are shown either not to militate against our Faith, or are rejected as false, he appeals to them again and again with as much boldness and assurance, as if they were quite to the purpose and universally admitted. Far from finding fault with his singular method of disputing, which undoubtedly has the great merit of being easy and concise, we, on our part, sincerely hope that it may always be pursued by the opponents of the Catholic Church. But the public, who have seen the heavy charges alleged against us and expected to see proofs weighty as the crimes, will naturally look upon the *Advocate’s* mode of arguing, (if arguing it can be called,) both as an insult to their understanding; and a wanton mockery over calumniated innocence.

The *Advocate* says that he does not reply to all the quibbles, assumptions and fallacies of the *Expositor*, nor refer to old facts as they are unanswerable, 1st, because the Catholic Advocates deny old facts in history. What old facts in history have we yet denied? NOT one. 2dly, because they will not acknowledge old forms and ceremonies. We have hitherto refused to acknowledge no old forms and ceremonies; unless the *Advocate* allude to the ‘wooden-cross sacrifice,’ ‘to the worship of idols,’ or to the ‘adoration of the Virgin’ which we have a right to deny when we know and can prove them to be false. 3dly, because they say that the infallible system has altered and changed. Where or when have we made such an assertion? We should feel extremely obliged to the *Advocate* if he would point out the place to us. We have said indeed that a Church, which varies like the Protestant, either is or has been in error: but as for the Catholic Church, we have so strongly and so repeatedly stated and enforced the very reverse of it, that the *Advocate* in his 13th number, began ironically to taunt us with the unchangeableness of our doctrine. But all this was a fortnight ago,—a long time for the *Advocate’s* memory, in which past and present events seem to mingle and float together with the same delightful confusion as notions of religion fluctuate in his mind. 4thly,

O

they cannot do either one or the other with modern facts. What! Cannot we then deny his modern facts? not his 'Infant-school story,' nor his story of the 'tongs,' nor his 'feast of the ass,' nor the divine worship paid to the Pope, nor the withholding the Bible from the Laity? not deny these? Oh! Yes! we can and do; but we blush for the *Advocate*, that he should have laid us under the necessity of declaring such assertions to be false. 5thly, *because we depend not for success on the exposing of a fallacy or the display of a quibble, but on demonstrating the unscripturalness of the fundamental principles and general practice of the Romish system.* What point is there either in our fundamental principles or in our general practice which he has yet attempted to demonstrate to be unscriptural? How joyfully should we see in him the least effort at proof and demonstration! Nay! we should welcome with delight even some finely spun net-work of sophistry; for, to unravel it, would be a task far more pleasing to gentlemen, than the rude one of giving a flat contradiction to almost every word uttered by Christian teachers of morality. Instead of the semblance of argument, he has given us much assertion. He has made statements without proof, on some doctrines which are ours, and on some which are not, and mentioned particular practices which are as far from being general as they are from being true. Our *fundamental* precepts are those of the ten commandments or the two grand ones of Jesus Christ; our *fundamental* tenets are contained in the Apostle's creed, and our *general* practice may be found in the Roman Liturgy. Is the *Advocate* about to demonstrate the unscripturalness of such points as these? Ingenious man! If he succeed in proving *them* to be unscriptural, he will go far beyond the skill of the Atheist, who takes care to throw scripture aside, before he endeavours to overturn the fundamental principles of Christianity. The *Advocate's* attempt will be novel in its kind and interesting! 6thly, *We have stated modern facts because they are undeniable,* (viz. the 'Infant-school story,' the 'tongs' the 'feast of the ass,' 'divine worship of the Pope,' 'refusing the Bible to the Laity,') *and show, whatever may be the explanation of its Advocates, Popery is the same all the world over and in all ages.* What! MODERN facts show that Popery is the same in ALL ages! Our errors thrown back on our ancestors! We had thought that the sins of the father were visited on the *children* to the third and fourth generation. Do our sins now go backward up the stream, and colour the waters where our forefathers drank? We, it is true, assert most strenuously, that the Catholic Church (how jealous the *Advocate* seems to be of our Church's right name!) is the same all the world over and in all ages. 'I believe in the holy Catholic Church'—catholic in place and time. It is one of our leading and *fundamental* articles; but we take a different method from the *Advocate* to prove and establish it. It is our custom to show, that the doctrine professed now is the same as that professed by the Church in every preceding age, by comparing one with the other. We had never thought of the ingenious method of 'modern facts' adopted by the *Advocate*.

'P.' is right. *The French prayer-book, in which the Virgin is represented as commanding her son, and which is deliberately thrown overboard by the Expositor, is as fully acknowledged by the Pope as the vulgate itself. It is better testimony* (what is better testimony? The disputed

French prayer-book, which he has neither himself seen nor met any one who has seen ?) *It is better testimony than the Expositor* ; (better testimony of what? we wish the *Advocate* would write more intelligibly;) *and it matters not whether the psalter of Bonaventure be his or not, — it is a wilful plagiarism on the Psalms of David, and that was the charge we brought against it.* It is not true that the French prayer-book has been thrown overboard by the *Expositor* ; it is not true that it has been at all acknowledged by the Pope, and still less it is true that it has been acknowledged by him as fully as the Vulgate. Moreover, it is not true that it matters not whether the Psalter of Bonaventure be the composition of St. Bonaventure, (which the *Advocate* asserted it was, and which we showed it was not,) nor is it true that the only charge, brought against it by him, was, that it is a wilful plagiarism on the Psalms of David. If that had been the only charge, we should have passed over it as undeserving of notice, because nothing to the purpose. But the *Advocate*, to make it as an argument against us, (which as an unsanctioned plagiarism it could not be,) declared that it was the composition of St. Bonaventure, found in the copy of his works approved by Sixtus V., and kept in the Vatican.

It is not true, as the *Advocate* further asserts, that *the Sodalties of the Sacred Heart of Jesus are a new form of Jesuitism, or that they were commenced by a Swiss fanatic, or that they have the least connexion with the society of Jesus or with any form of free masonry.* We recommend him strongly to read with attention the whole of a little book entitled ‘The Sacred Heart of Jesus.’ He will there discover, that the wonderful secrets of *Jesuit Free masonry* are, how to love the heart of Jesus which hath so much loved us. It is not true that *the Bishop of Cologne was banished for exciting political dissatisfaction on the subject of mixed marriages, or for corresponding with Jesuits under the rose in a grand scheme for the destruction of Protestantism on the continent.* He was thrown into prison, because he could not be prevailed upon by a tyrannical government to act against his conscience and the long-established laws of his church.

With respect to dissensions, there is this difference between the Protestant Church and the Catholic, that the faith of the former is broken into a thousand distinct sects which again are continually changing and varying their forms, whereas the latter, like Truth herself, both in principle and fact is essentially one. Disputes, jealousies and heart-burnings, on matters unconnected with Faith, may exist amongst a few of the members of the several Religious orders ; two Anti-Popes may rise up against the true Pope, and cause a hateful schism in the Church ; two Catholic nations may go to war with each other, and riot in mutual havock and bloodshed ; but though Catholic Charity is violated for a time, Catholic Faith continues one and the same.

The rapid stride which the Catholic Religion is making all over the known world, especially in Europe, seems to fill the breasts of Sectarians with the greatest alarm for the safety of Protestantism, and every little effort made by any Catholic Priest for the good of religion is viewed with terror. Judging from the sign of the times we are inclined to think that it would be as easy to stop the progress of the great Orb of day as to impede the diffusion of Catholicism, guided as both are by the hand of Di-

vine Providence ! We have been led to this remark by a perusal of the following pieces of intelligence gleaned from the daily papers :—

TRAPPISTS.—It gives us no small surprise, says the *Inverness Herald*, to observe one of the monks of La Trappe, soliciting contributions in this quarter for a monastery of their order in Leicestershire. It is a striking sign of the times that those institutions of the dark ages should be again in course of erection in Protestant and enlightened England ; but that contributions for the object should be sought in Scotland is passing strange.—*Atlas*, June 15.

THE ROMAN RELIGION.—Not only at the meeting of Chartists, but at other meetings, wild statements and expressions escape enthusiastic speakers, calculated to do much mischief. A remarkable instance (says the *Shrewsbury Chronicle*) occurred at a public meeting held in this town on Thursday. One of the (Reverend) speakers, on the authority of a printed statement in the report of a Bristol Society, uttered the startling assertion, that the East India Company had sent to the Pope for a band of Roman Priests to be sent to Calcutta to establish the Roman Religion, and that the Pope hailed this request as full evidence of the desire of England to return to the Romish faith ! Immediately on this assertion being made, Sir R. Jenkins, who happened to be the chairman, rose and said :—‘ As chairman of the East India Company, I rise to give the Reverend Gentleman’s statement a flat and unqualified contradiction. I deny most distinctly the truth of any such application ever having been made by the East India Company.’—*Chronicle*.

SCRIPTURE ALONE NOT A SUFFICIENT RULE OF FAITH.

In our fifth number we stated some of the grounds on which we reject the fundamental principle of Protestantism ; namely, that Scripture *alone*, interpreted by private judgment, is a safe and sufficient rule of faith, by which all mankind, learned and unlearned, may arrive at the certain knowledge of all those Truths which God hath revealed, and commanded us under pain of condemnation to believe. We maintained that there is not a tittle of authority in the Scripture itself for such doctrine ; and adduced our reasons for believing, that the books which compose the New Testament, written, as we showed them to have been, under various circumstances and on various occasions, were never designed by the Sacred Penmen to form an independent code of Christian doctrine, which should at any time supersede and render void the authority of tradition, by which the Church was established. We noticed some other, as we think, insuperable objections to the Protestant rule of faith ; and we shall now point out further difficulties to it, and adduce the testimony of some of the early Fathers of the Church, and the admissions of learned Protestants on the subject.

Our opponents maintain, that the whole of the doctrine taught by Christ and his Apostles has been recorded in the New Testament. What authority they can advance in support of this opinion, is more than we are able to conceive. Certainly not that of St. John, who clearly intimates the contrary : ‘ And many other signs truly did Jesus, which are *not written* in this Book.’ And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if *they should be written*, every one, I suppose, that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written.’ (*John* xx. 50. xxi. 25.) We, however, assert that all the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles has

not been recorded in the New Testament, and, in proof of this assertion we may adduce the two following instances.

In the decalogue we are commanded to keep holy the Sabbath-day : *Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy.* The SEVENTH-DAY is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. (Exod. xx.) On the other hand Christ declares, that he is *not come to destroy the law, but to fulfil it.* (Matt. v. 17.) He himself observed the Sabbath : and, *as his custom was, he went into the Synagogue on the Sabbath-day.* (Luke iv. 16.) His disciples likewise observed it after his death : *they rested on the Sabbath-day according to the commandment,* (Luke xxiii. 56.) Yet with all this weight of Scripture-authority for keeping the Sabbath on *Saturday, the seventh-day*, Protestants of all denominations make this a *prophane day*, and transfer the obligation of it to *Sunday, or the first day of the week.* Now, what authority have they for doing this ?

Again, where is there a precept in the whole Scripture more express than that against eating blood ? ‘ God said to Noah : every moving thing that liveth shall be meat to you—but flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall you not eat.’ (Gen. ix. 4.) This prohibition we know was confirmed by Moses, and by the Apostles, and was imposed upon the Gentiles, who were converted to the Faith. (Acts xv. 20.) Nevertheless, where is the religious Protestant, who scruples to eat puddings made of blood ? Now, we would ask those who set aside tradition, upon what authority they presume to act in direct contradiction to the express words of both the Old and New Testament. We shall confine our notice to one more instance of Protestants abandoning their *own* rule of Faith.

Is there an ordinance in the New Testament more clearly or more expressly enjoined than the *washing of feet*. To convince one’s self of this, it is only necessary to read the first seventeen verses of the twenty-third chapter of St. John, and to observe the motive assigned for Christ’s performing the ceremony there recorded : namely, ‘ his love for his disciples :’ next the time of his performing it : namely, when he is about to depart out of this world : then observe the stress he lays upon it, in what he said to Peter : *If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me :* finally, his injunctions at the conclusion of the ceremony : *If I, your Lord and master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another’s feet.* Here we again beg to ask, upon what pretext those who profess to make Scripture their only religious guide, disregard this positive precept. The truth is, they condemn tradition and yet follow it ; but in the instances above cited, they are right without knowing it. Let them not however be alarmed on this account, the tradition of the Catholic Church is by far a safer authority to go by than their own weak and wavering notions of the meaning of the Bible. ‘ Therefore, brethren, stand fast ; and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word or by our epistle.’ (2. *Thess.* ii. 14). ‘ And we charge you, brethren, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that you withdraw yourselves from every brother walking disorderly, and not according to the tradition which they have received of us.’ (*Ibid* iii. 6.)

Since the Bible and the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants, they ought consistently, with their own principle, to give their children no religious instruction ; but leave them to extract a religious system for themselves out of the Bible. They ought to have no religious teachers, no

Gospel expounders ; and instead of sending self denying Missionaries to convert the heathens, they ought to send them a plentiful supply of Bibles. The truth however is, that Protestants generally either imbibe the religion of their parents before they even read the Bible, or believe as they are told by their respective pastors. This glaring inconsistency is a virtual admission, whatever they may allege to the contrary, that however well the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, may sound in theory, they find it insufficient in practice.

It is quite the fashion now-a-days with our creed-makers to declaim with pious indignation against the Church, for reserving to herself the right of explaining the true meaning of scripture, while they modestly assume to each of themselves infinitely more authority in such matters than ever was claimed by the Catholic Church, *the pillar and ground of truth*. Her authority extends only to declaring the true sense of the sacred text as delivered by the Apostles, and always received by the universal Church ; but they take upon themselves to make new doctrines out of the scripture ; doctrines never thought of by the Apostles and their successors.

We appeal to candour and common sense whether there could be any thing more preposterous than the supposition that illiterate and uneducated persons, for such is the bulk of mankind, are competent to comprehend the true meaning of the Scripture which, according to the immortal Edmund Burke, 'is one summary of Christian doctrine regularly digested, in which a man could not mistake his way. It is a most venerable, but a most multifarious collection of the records of the divine economy, a collection of an infinite variety of cosmogony, theology, history, prophecy, psalmody, morality, apologue, allegory, legislation, ethics, carried through different books, for different ends and purposes,' (*Vol. 5 p. 335*). With reason did the Ethiopian answer to Philip, *How can I [understand the Scripture he was reading,] unless some one show me.* (*See Acts viii. 27.*) 'Would you have them' (the people, says Dr. Balguy, Archdeacon of Winchester) 'think for themselves? Would you have them hear and decide the controversies of the learned? Would you have them enter into the depths of criticism, of logic, of scholastic divinity? You might as well expect them to compute an eclipse or decide between the Cartesian and Newtonian philosophy.'

The right of interpreting the Scripture and forming their own systems of faith out of it according to individual humour and fancy, was called Gospel-liberty by the early reformers ; it is a liberty however for which, there is no sanction in Scripture, in which, it is clearly condemned. 'And God, indeed hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondly Prophets, thirdly Teachers. Are all Apostles? all Prophets? all Teachers?' (*I Cor. xii, 28 and 29.*) According to the principle which forms the basis of Protestantism, the answer to these interrogatories would be ALL, ALL. 'And he gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and other some Evangelists, and other some Pastors and Doctors, for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the ministry for the edifying of the body of Christ ; that henceforth we be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the wickedness of men, by cunning craftiness. (*Ephes. iv. 11, 12, 14.*)

On reading this passage two questions naturally suggest themselves : What would be the use of these authorities if every one were to judge for himself out of the Bible ? And, without submission to their authority how could they prevent Christians from being *tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine* ? According to the Protestant rule, the Bible alone was all that was required ; for the Bible, the whole Bible, (which, by the bye, they have not got) and nothing but the Bible, is the religion of Protestants.

Let us see, what the Fathers say on private judgment.—St. Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, speaking of the heretics of his time, says, ‘and not only from the Evangelical and Apostolical Writings, which they perversely interpret and wickedly expound, do these (heretics) attempt to prove their assertions, but also, from the Law and the Prophets. For, as there are, in these many parables and allegories which may be forced into various meanings, them they craftily fit to their own purpose ;’ again, ‘*so varying are their notions drawn from the Scriptures*’ * * * when, therefore they shall be agreed among themselves on what they draw from the Scriptures it will be our time to refute them ;’ * * * ‘but we,’ he says, ‘*always speak alike of the same things.*’ (Adv. Hær. : L. I. c. iii.)

‘And why,’ exclaims Tertullian, who flourished in 194, ‘are heretics aliens and enemies to the Apostles, but from the diversity of doctrine which each one of them, as he likes best, has himself advanced or received in opposition to them ? *Where therefore this diversity of doctrine is, there will the scriptures and expounding of them be adulterated.*’ A little further on he observes, ‘I am much deceived if these men even agree in their own rules, while each one according to his own fancy, modifies what he has received, as he did, who delivered it.’ (De Præscrip. p. 338, 339.)

Origen, who flourished in 203, remarks that ‘He, who, reading the Gospel, applies to it his own interpretation, not understanding as the Lord spoke it, truly he is a false prophet, uttering words from his own mind. These words may fairly be understood of heretics, for they apply their own fables to the Gospels and the writings of the Apostles ; *expounding by their own judgment*, and not according to the sense of the Holy Spirit.’ (Hom. 11. in Ezech. T. iii. p. 362.)

The great St. Basil, who died in 376, thus addresses a heretic : ‘What is it you say ? Shall we not allow more to antiquity ? Does not the multitude of Christians claim respect who now are, as well as those who went before us ? These abounded in every grace, *and must we disregard them, against whom you have lately brought your impious discoveries* ? Must we shut our eyes, and suppressing all recollection of every holy man, submit our understanding to your deceptions and idle sophistries ? Truly, your influence must be great, if, what the devil could not effect by his wiles, we should concede to dictation ; that is, persuaded by you, we should prefer your inventions to that tradition of belief, which, in all former times, prevailed under the direction of some holy men.’ (L. I. Adv. Eunom. T. 1.)

‘The art of understanding the Scripture,’ says St. Jerom, who flourished in 376, ‘alone is open to every reader ! Here learned or unlearned, we can all interpret. The tattling old woman, the doating old man, the wordy sophist, all, all here presume ; they tear texts assunder, and dare become teachers before they have learned. Some you may see surrounded by

a female circle, weighing out with a solemn brow their pompous phrases, and discussing the import of these sacred oracles; while others, oh, shame ! are taking lessons from the women, that they may be able to instruct the men, &c.' (*Ep. L. T. iv. part. ii.*)

Vincent of Lerins, who wrote in 434 says, that *we 'are to interpret the divine text according to the tradition of the Catholic Church;'* And, in another place, that in interpreting Scripture we are '*to take the sense of the Catholic Church for our rule.*' It would be needless to multiply quotations as all the early Fathers of the Church speak with one voice on the subject, but we may adduce the admissions of learned Protestants.

'When Bellarmin,' says Whitaker, 'states the question thus, viz. whether the scriptures are in themselves so clear, and so plain, as without any interpretation to decide controversies of Faith, he fights without an adversary, for in *this* we agree with him,' (Con. 12, 4 c.,) 'Of this we are right sure,' says Hooker, 'that nature, scripture, and experience itself have taught the world to seek for the ending of contentions by submitting to some judicial and definite sentence, whereunto neither parties that contendeth may under any pretence of colour refuse to stand.' He again observes that 'the scripture could not teach us the things of God, unless we did credit men, who have taught us that, the words of scripture did signify these things.' (*Ecel. Polity. p. 116.*)

'Writers of Roman religion' (says the ingenious Lord Bolingbroke) 'have attempted to shew that the text of holy writ is on many accounts insufficient to be the sole criterion of orthodoxy. I apprehend too, that they have shewn it. Sure I am, that experience, from the first promulgation of Christianity to this hour, shews abundantly, with how much ease and success, the most opposite, the most extravagant, nay, the most *impious* opinions, and the most contradictory faiths may be founded on the same text, and defended by the same authority (*Letters on use and study of Hist. 5. p. 179.*) What a *glorious* rule of Christian faith, condemned by their hero Chillingworth himself in his sober moments; hear him !

'When Protestants (says he) affirm against Papists, that scripture is a perfect rule of faith, their meaning is, not *that* by scripture all things may be proved which are to be believed, for it can never be proved by scripture that there is a God! or that the book called scripture is the word of God, for nothing is proved true for being written in a book but only by tradition, which is a thing credible of itself. (*Chap. i. p. 55, sec. 8.*)

'And doubtless (says Cheynell) the Papists will give him hearty thanks for this answer, which doth prefer *tradition* to scripture, and they will be well pleased to see this doctrine licensed by the University of Oxford that tradition is more credible than scripture, for tradition is credible, for itself. The scripture by tradition only.' (*Chillingworth Novissima.*)

'The word of God,' says the learned Dr. Walton, in the prologomena to his Polyglot, 'does not consist in mere letters, whether written or printed but in the *true sense* of it; which no one can better interpret, than the true Church to which Christ committed this sacred pledge.' 'Show me,' says Bishop Hurd, 'a single text though ever so plain, and precise,

which the perverseness, or ingenuity of interpreters, has not drawn into different and often quite opposite meanings.' Selden, though a Puritan, declared : ' These two words, *Scrutamini Scripturas* (search the Scriptures) have undone the world.' Columns might be quoted to the same effect, but this will suffice to show what the force of truth has wrung from even the most learned of our adversaries.

' Should any one enquire,' says Vincent of Lerins, ' while they advance their errors—what proof have you ? whence do you learn that it is my duty, as you say, to depart from the universal and ancient faith of the Catholic Church ? Without hesitation they reply : so it is written (*Matt.* ix. 6.) and at once they have ready a thousand testimonies, a thousand examples, and a thousand authorities from the law, the Psalms, the Prophets, the Apostles ; which interpreted after a new and evil fashion, may cast the unhappy soul from the Catholic Rock, into the abyss of heresy.

CATHOLIC SECURITY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR*.

SIR,—The most eminent Protestant Divines acknowledge that salvation may be found in the communion of the Catholic Church, and even the conductors of the *Calcutta Christian Advocate*, as also some of its correspondents, admit, that a good Catholic can obtain salvation. What then do we want more ? For what purpose do we profess Christianity ? Is it not solely for the salvation of our souls ? After admitting that we can be saved, with what design and intention do the jarring societies of Protestants, being themselves devoid of any system, trouble their heads about our Religion, our Faith, our Doctrine and our Practices ? Why abuse, why calumniate, and why wilfully pervert, and unblushingly misrepresent our faith ? As the Catholics of Bengal are well known to be the most quiet, peaceable and humble subjects of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, I am at a loss, what could have contributed to excite the bile of these Sectarrians, as we have not meddled either with their religious, or with their worldly pursuits in any manner whatever.

What advantage will the Catholics derive, beyond what they already possess, if the society of different religious denominations should succeed in reclaiming them ? Perhaps the organ of the said heterogeneous society will kindly enlighten us on this point, and unequivocally declare what we may gain by being proselytised by them.

If these champions of Protestantism are as well convinced and satisfied of the truth of their faith as we the Catholics are, and consider their hopes of future bliss as well founded as they admit ours to be, would it not be advisable in them to leave off honoring us with their fraternal solicitude about our future welfare ; and prudently confine their charity to proclaiming all Protestant Religions to be right : thus dividing truth, which is in itself essentially indivisible ; while the Catholic Church shall unassumingly continue to maintain, as she has ever maintained, that *there is only one Faith and one True Church* ; and I shall conclude by observing that if TRUTH be more ancient than ERROR, then our Church is the original True Church of Christ.

JACQUES.

P

Selections.

A SKETCH OF PROTESTANTISM.

BY A CONVERT.

(*From the Orthodox Journal.*)

That Protestantism is a system of irreligion and radically vicious in principle, since it opens the door to every species of fanaticism, and cannot consistently disown, is sufficiently elicited from the Protestant Ecclesiastical and Political History of Hornius, the celebrated defender of the Reformation.

Luther, says he, having established the right which each individual possesses of interpreting the sacred scriptures, asserted too, that assisted by the light of heaven he possessed the privilege affixing to them their true interpretation. Admitting with Luther, at least the former of these principles, Zuinglius presents himself, but boldly declares, that not Luther, but he, and long before Luther likewise, had pointed out their true interpretation. Here Carlostadius comes forth, and with equal intrepidity, proclaims that he has made a more accurate discovery of their real signification than either of the above apostles, and instantly, in defiance of his master's authority, breaks in pieces the images which he found in the churches at Wittemberg, and excited great commotions in that city. Not long after this, these three leaders of the Reformation commenced their dispute respecting the holy Eucharist, a dispute in which were often blended circumstances the most ludicrous, with acts of violence the most atrocious. The champions on each side drew after them, each an immense multitude of followers in different Kingdoms, provinces, and districts, just as the *pretended* evidence of the sense of the scriptures, or their pretended inspiration, deluded them; or, rather, just as their ignorance and their passions, which were under the control of their leaders, conducted them. During the contestation between Luther, Zuinglius, and Carlostadius, a Silesian gentleman, of the name Schevenckfeld, discovered another interpretation of the words, 'This is my body,' extremely different, both from that of Luther, and from that of his two antagonists. He maintained that the word 'This,' expresses not elemental, but purely spiritual bread and wine; and proceeding from error to error, contended soon, that the letter of scripture is useless, and that all external ministry in the Church is superfluous. Shevenckfeld drew after him a great multitude of partizans, whose descendants, still numerous, subsist unmolested in some of the villages of Silesia at the present day.

Beginning with the same maxims as the first reformers, and raising upon them the fabric of their singular institution, Stork and Munster, both of them the disciples, and the latter the great favourite, of Luther, began, about the same period, to teach a variety of tenets that were contrary to those of their master. The most prominent of these tenets were the necessity of re-baptizing all those who had been baptized in their infancy, and the establishment of a new kingdom foretold in the Apocalypse, which was destined to last a thousand years, and to begin from themselves. Fired with the ambition and necessity of forming and completing this new empire, they taught that it was proper, *pious*, and *even necessary*, to depose or murder all princes and magistrates who ventured to oppose its establishment. Munster assured his followers, that God had given him, in a vision, the sword of Gideon, and even commissioned the archangel Michael to assist him. Suffice it to say, that soon about one hundred thousand deluded creatures believed and followed the impostor, upwards of fifty thousand of whom perished in the field, the victims to his ambition, and the dupes of their imbecility. The greater part of them fell without either fighting, or attempting to run away, convinced, as Munster had promised them, either that he would stop the balls in the foldings of his robe, or catch them so that no one should be wounded.

After the death of Munster, who met with the fate his crimes merited, his sect, so far from decreasing, continued to multiply, and counted an immense number of adherents in every country where the seeds of the Reformation had been sown. He had several successors, some of them as ambitious, and many of them as fanatic, as himself. Rotman, Knipperdoling, Matthew, John of Leyden, who from a tailor was raised to the dignity, or at least proclaimed, the universal monarch of the earth; and who breathing nothing but inspiration spread round him nothing but murder and devastation. Happily, however, the dreadful power which these men possessed, and the more dreadful effects which it produced were but transient. The states in which the sect was most numerous, alarmed for their security, adopted measures to repress it; and their measures, by being rigorous, were in general effectual. The consequence was, as they could no longer be seditious with impunity, they gradually became moderate; and chiefly by the influence and advice of Menno, abandoned the idea of having recourse to arms. Having therefore sunk into a state of indolence and inaction, and instead of contending with princes for their kingdoms, disputing with themselves about words, they soon began to fritter into distinct societies, which have very little resemblance to each other, except the general appellation of Anabaptists. They are divided into Mennonites, Hutterians, Gabrielists, Moravians, &c. &c. among whom there prevails a degree of confusion, equal to that which reigned at Babel. Some deny the Trinity; some deny the distinction of persons; some maintain that all learning, particularly that of the languages, is the gift of Satan. Some, — so that such is the variety and absurdity of their multiplied opinions, it is difficult to ascertain what they consist of in reality.

From the school of the Anabaptists came forth several new heresiarchs. — George Delpht, who called himself the true Messiah, and who drew after him a great number of disciples in several parts of Holland. Haney, surnamed house of charity, who ranked himself above Moses and Jesus Christ. William Postel, who taught that himself had delivered *men*, while his wife had delivered *women*, from eternal death.

About this period began to appear, on the theatre of the Reformation, the sect of the Socinians. Their doctrines are a compound of those of Ebion, Arius, Sabellius, Chotinus, Abelard, and several other heresiarchs. With a boldness, which Christianity should not tolerate, and which is dangerous to civil governments, they began to corrupt and undermine all the truths of revelation. Servetus was the first founder of the sect; Gentilis gave it some celebrity; but Laetius Socinus, the bosom friend of Calvin, diffused it, while Faustus, the nephew of Laetius, organized it into a system.

To the aid of impiety, there also, in 1552, rose up the heresy of the Ubiquitarians, who maintained, along with many other errors, that body of Jesus Christ is every where personally present, and that all the properties of the divine nature were infused into his human nature by the hypostatic union. — Hence, they taught, that the body of Christ is contained in a glass of beer, in a sack of corn, and in the rope with which the criminal is hanged. Their first apostle was John Westphalus, a minister of Hamburg, who was succeeded by Brentius, Wigand, Illyricus, Osiander, Schmidling, and several others, the greatness of whose learning was only exceeded by the greatness of their impiety.

During the growth and propagation of these errors, six of the principal leaders of the Ubiquitarians composed a book which they entitled '*The Book of Concord*,' and which they proposed to the general acceptance and subscription of all the Protestant societies, under pain of being excluded from the communion of the Augsburg confession. The publication of this book served only to increase the spread of confusion and disorder. It created new schisms among the gospellers, who were already divided into Lutherans, Calvinists, Phillipists, Flaccans, &c. &c.; some of whom received the Augsburg confession without alteration, some only admitted it with corrections.

In Holland, the reformation had hardly superseded Catholicity, when its

tranquillity began to be disturbed by the new and formidable society of Arminians. These, treading in the footsteps of the Socinians, or, more properly, real Socinians themselves, not only entertain the most impious tenets respecting grace and predestination, they also teach that it is wrong to worship the Holy Ghost, and that the Trinity is merely an object of speculation, &c. — Armed with these errors, and strong in the host of learned men who defended them, and still stronger in the multitudes of the unlearned, who were deluded to believe them, the Arminians not only formed a schism in the Low Countries, but they excited seditions and disturbances throughout the nation, which hardly the arm of justice, though wielding the sword of persecution, and often staining it with blood, was able to repress. However, at length force, aided by the synod of Dort, did re-establish peace, though nothing like unanimity.

Among the reformed churches, frequent attempts were made to bring about a reconciliation but such was the turbulence of their respective leaders, and such their ardour for error and innovation, that every attempt proved fruitless and abortive. Hulsman, Calovius, Rotsae, Danhauwer, a crowd of other reformers, and particularly those of Wittemberg, insolently armed themselves with new violence to create divisions.

In England, *as in all other countries*, the introduction of the reformation was the introduction of division, discord, and disorder. The passions of Henry had altered many of the ancient doctrines of the church. Edward added fresh changes to those of Henry, and Elizabeth increased the changes of Edward. However, along with all these changes there was still permitted to subsist a multitude of Popish ceremonies, and the tyrant anti-christian institution of episcopacy. All these objects, but particularly the latter, were extremely obnoxious to the followers of Calvin, who, at this period, were become very numerous and very formidable to the natives, under the name of Puritans. The contest between these and the established Churches forms a very striking epoch in the annals of English history.

Nothing is so easy as for men to run into extremes. This was soon the case with the puritans. They early began to fritter themselves into various classes of Brownists, Separatists, Semi-separatists, Robinsonians, and the numerous sects of Independents. The number of these sects exceed forty. In short England was infected with the venom of every species of corrupted opinion. There was nothing sacred that was not reprobated as profane; nor hardly aught profane that was not maintained as sacred. Even the most ignorant and the poorest became preachers, alleging in their own defence, 'That the spirit breathes where it pleases,' and that truth is not confined to the schools of learning. They preached, and the populace was blind enough to believe them. How well to use the words of the commentators of the English Bible, on the 25th verse of the 10th chapter of Genesis—how well does the name of Phaleg become our times? How well might we give this name (it signifies division) to every child that comes into the world? How easy would it be to fill up our annals with this name, so deplorable are our divisions? Never since the creation of the world did there exist so many monstrous opinions as there are at present in England.

From the body of the Independents, as from the Trojan horse, there came forth upwards of forty different sects. Some of them rejected the scriptures; some taught there was no longer any church of God whatever on earth—these were called Waiters; some maintained that there was indeed a church but that it was hidden, and these were called Seekers. The opinions of some of these sectaries *are too horrible to be related*. For my own part, I think as those do, who say, that England is the nurse of errors, and the great theatre where exists the most dreadful licentiousness of believing, writing, and teaching, whatever passions or folly is pleased to dictate. The history of the heresies and schisms of other nations, present nothing to be compared to the scenes of error which it exhibits.—At periods, also, still more recent than those to which I have alluded. Great Britain continued to hold out to the rest of Europe, the same,

or nearly the same, scenes of extravagance and impiety with the above. You might often find in one family as many religions as there were individuals composed it. The pretext and apology for all this, mere *liberty of conscience*, and the privilege of general toleration. In *reality*, nothing is more flattering to self *love* and *vanity*, than to *judge for one's-self*, to assume the Ephod, and to be the arbiter of our own belief.

DECLARATION OF THE CATHOLIC BISHOPS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

(Concluded from No. 6 Page 99.)

SECTION VIII.

On allegiance to our Sovereign and obedience to the Pope.

CATHOLICS are charged with *dividing their allegiance between their temporal sovereign and the Pope.*

Allegiance relates not to *spiritual* but to *civil* duties ; those temporal tributes and obligations, which the subject owes to the person of his sovereign, and to the authority of the state.

By the term *spiritual*, we here mean that which in its nature tends *directly* to a *supernatural* end, or is ordained to produce a *supernatural* effect. Thus the office of teaching the doctrine of faith, the administration of the sacraments, the conferring and exercising of jurisdiction purely ecclesiastical, are *spiritual* matters.

By the term *temporal*, we mean that which in its nature tends *directly* to the end of *civil* society. Thus the right of making laws for the civil government of the state, the administration of civil justice, the appointment of civil magistrates and military officers, are *temporal* matters.

The allegiance which Catholics hold to be due are bound to pay to their sovereign, and to the civil authority of the state is perfect and undivided. They do not divide their allegiance between their sovereign and any other power on earth, whether temporal or ecclesiastical. They acknowledge in the sovereign, and in the constituted government of these realms a supreme civil and temporal authority, which is entirely distinct from, and totally independent of the spiritual and ecclesiastical authority of the Pope and of the Catholic Church. They declare that neither the Pope nor any other prelate or ecclesiastical person of the Roman Catholic Church, has in virtue of his spiritual or ecclesiastical character, any right, directly or indirectly, to any civil or temporal jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, within this realm ; nor has any right to interfere, directly or indirectly, in the civil government of the United Kingdom, or any part thereof ; nor to oppose, in any manner, the performance of the civil duties which are due to his Majesty, his heirs, and successors, from all or any of his Majesty's subjects ; nor to enforce the performance of any *spiritual* or *ecclesiastical* duty, by any *civil* or *temporal* means. They hold themselves bound in conscience to obey the civil government of this realm, in all things of a temporal and civil nature, notwithstanding any dispensation or order the contrary had, or to be had, from the Pope, or any authority of the Church of Rome.

Hence we declare, that by rendering obedience in *spiritual* matters to the Pope, Catholics do not withhold any portion of their allegiance to their King, and that their allegiance is entire and undivided ; the *civil* power of the state, and the *spiritual* authority of the Catholic Church, being absolutely distinct, and being never intended by the Divine Author to interfere or clash with each other.

'Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's.'

SECTION IX.

On the claim of British Catholics to the property of the Church Establishment in England.

BRITISH Catholics are charged with entertaining a *pretended right to the property of the established Church in England.*

We consider such a charge to be totally without foundation. We declare that we entertain no pretension to such a claim. We regard all the revenues and temporalities of the Church Establishment as the property of those on whom they are settled by the laws of the land. We disclaim any right, title, or pretension with regard to the same.

SECTION X.

On the Doctrine of Exclusive Salvation.

CATHOLICS are charged with *uncharitableness, in holding the doctrine of exclusive salvation.*

Catholics are taught by their Church to love all men, without exception : to wish that all may be saved ; and to pray that all may be saved, and may come to the knowledge of the truth, by which they may be saved.

If the Almighty himself has assigned certain conditions, without the observance of which man cannot be saved, it would seem to be an act of impiety to attempt to annul those divine established conditions : and an act of great uncharitableness towards a fellow man, to tell him that he may be saved without complying with the conditions prescribed by the Almighty.

The doctrinal principle of exclusive salvation belongs to the law of Christ.

Has not Christ, who commands the belief of his revealed doctrines, pronounced, that he that *believeth not shall be condemned ?* (Mark, xvi. 16). Has not Christ, who instituted baptism for the remission of sins, declared that *except a man be born again of water and of the Holy Ghost, he CANNOT enter into the kingdom of God ?* (John, iii. 5). Has not St. Paul enumerated a list of crimes, such as adultery, idolatry, hatred, seditions, heresies, murders, drunkenness, &c. of which he declares, that *they who do such things shall not obtain the kingdom of God ?* (Galat. v. 21.) Are not these exclusive conditions ?

Whoever professes the law of Christ must profess the *principle* and doctrine of exclusive salvation. It is not the Catholic, it is God himself who will exclude from heaven those who are not duly qualified for it by faith and good works.

But the Catholic, whilst he is bound to admit, and with firm faith to believe, this doctrinal *principle*, is bound also by the divine commandment not to judge. He is not allowed therefore to pronounce sentence of condemnation on individuals, who may live and die out of the external communion of the Catholic Church : nor to pronounce sentence of condemnation against those who may die in an apparent state of sin. All those he leaves to the righteous judgment of the Great Searcher of Hearts, who at the last day will render to every man according to his works.

But surely charity, as well as truth must forbid one Christian to deceive another, in a matter of such infinite importance as the eternal salvation of his soul. He who should persuade his neighbour, that no condition for salvation is required on the part of man, would deceive him. He who admits that any one such condition is required by the Almighty, admits the *principle* of exclusive salvation.

SECTION XI.

On keeping Faith with Heretics.

CATHOLICS are charged with holding the principle that *they are not bound to keep faith with Heretics.*

As Catholics, we hold and we declare, that all Catholics are bound by the law of nature, and by the law of revealed religion, to observe the duties of fidelity and justice to all men, without any exception of persons, and without any distinction of nation or religion.

British Catholics have solemnly sworn, ' that they reject and detest that un-

christian and impious principle, that faith is not to be kept with heretics or infidels.'

After this the imputation of their holding this principle, cannot but be felt by them as grievously injurious to their religious and moral character.

CONCLUSION.

HAVING, in the foregoing declaration, endeavoured to state, in the simplicity of truth, such doctrines of our Church as are most frequently misrepresented or misunderstood in this country, and to explain the meaning in which Catholics understand the terms by which these doctrines are expressed in the language of their church; we confidently trust, that this declaration and explanation will be received by all our fellow subjects, in a spirit of candour and charity; and that those who have been hitherto ignorant of, or but imperfectly acquainted with our doctrines of faith, will do us the justice to acknowledge, that, as Catholics, we hold no religious principles, and entertain no opinions flowing from those principles, which are not perfectly consistent with our duties as Christians, and as British subjects.

This declaration we, the undersigned, approve, and publish, as an exposition of our principles and doctrines, on the subjects to which it refers.

[Here follow the signatures of the Vicars Apostolic and Coadjutors.]

INTELLIGENCE.

(From London Catholic Magazine, April 1839.)

ENGLAND.—NEW CHAPEL AT SOLIHULL.—This chapel was opened for divine service on the 6th Feb. High mass was performed by the Rev. Dr. Weedall, assisted by the Rev. Mr. Nickolls, as deacon, and the Rev. Mr. Moore, as sub-deacon. The sermon was preached by the Rev. T. M. Macdonell. At vespers a discourse was delivered by the Rev. Mr. Mitchell. The chapel, which is from the design of Mr. Pugin, is a neat gothic edifice, fifty feet by forty-two, with three windows on each side, three over the door, and a mullioned one, in five compartments over the altar. The interior ornaments correspond strictly with the chasteness of the design.

READING.—*(From a Correspondent.)*—The favourable dispositions at present manifested in the conduct of numbers of Protestants, of all denominations, towards the Catholic Faith, have called forth all the virulence and hatred of the bigotted and illiberal of the apostate church. In no place have these bad feelings shown themselves more of late than at Reading. As long as the Catholics of this town were constrained to meet, and offer their humble adoration to the God of heaven, in an obscure and unsightly place of worship, no particular notice was taken of them. But now that these interested and bitter enemies of our holy faith behold a magnificent church rising from amidst the imposing ruins of the once noble and splendid St. Mary's Abbey, their indignation can find no bounds. Until within these three or four years past, the Catholics of this place have silently and patiently submitted to hear their creed reviled and most grossly misrepresented; but happily they have been favoured with an able and talented champion for the cause of truth, in the person of the Rev. J. Ringrose, chaplain to James Wheble, Esq. of Woodley Lodge, near Reading. This Rev. Gentleman has, on several occasions, fully exposed and ably refuted, in the public papers of the town, the false and profane charges made against our church, by the local clergy and itinerant mountebanks, in the pulpits and at public Bible Society meetings. By this means, impressions the most favourable have been made on very many of those, whose minds were hitherto strongly imbued with prejudice and hatred of our holy religion. The above-named Rev. Gentleman is now engaged in delivering a course of controversial lectures, at the Catholic chapel in the town, to a crowded Protestant audience. The clear but strong and powerful arguments brought forward by the reverend preacher, in favour of the Catholic and against the Protestant church, have produced a wonderful effect on the minds of his hearers. A system of intimidation of the worst character, threatening

ruin to whole families, has been adopted, to prevent those who are convinced of the truth from embracing it; and this too by ministers who, if they were to act consistently, are bound to preach and enforce the right of private judgment. However, it is not the character of Englishmen patiently to submit to such a system of persecution; and therefore it may be confidently expected that many, notwithstanding these threats, will openly embrace the faith of their Catholic and pious ancestors.

MORPETH.—Religious feeling is at present very strong here, in consequence of lectures delivered by the Rev. Mr. Lowe, Catholic pastor of the town, during Lent, explanatory of Catholic doctrines. The chapel has been crowded at each lecture by Protestants; and, notwithstanding the extra room made by the removal of the benches, many have been obliged to return home without obtaining admittance. These Protestants all seem well inclined towards the Catholic religion.

NORTH AND SOUTH SHIELDS.—With reference to the branch of the Catholic Institute which has been lately formed here, a correspondent, and distinguished convert, thus writes. 'In addition to the remark in the report contained in the *Gateshead Observer*, it is only proper to add, that throughout the proceedings the greatest enthusiasm prevailed, and one entire feeling of gratitude to the originators and more active members of the society. The position of the Catholic body in this busy population, is not only commanding, but such as to warrant us in believing that the day is not far distant when England, glorious England, will right herself again, and reoccupy that position in the church of Christ she for so many centuries maintained; and that even, in our day, the heart-stirring appeals of the ever-honoured convert, the Hon. and Rev. George Spencer, may be realised. Blessed, as are the Shields congregation, with a priest, who, though in the 70th year of his age, possesses all the vigour of a young missionary, it would ill become them to 'hang fire' when called upon by their revered metropolitan brethren; and the parent institute may always rely, in the hour of need, on their Shields' branch defending the post of danger. The committee are led to hope, that when the people of the 'distant north' are thus responding to the appeal of the parent Institution, congregations of greater extent, and much greater affluence, will not continue to exhibit a coldness and apathy, when, by united exertions, bigotry and prejudice may be destroyed, or at least dissipated and rendered harmless.'

ROME.—On the 10th of November, Cardinal Gregorio opened a small seminary at Civita Vecchia, which is within his diocese. His Eminence delivered a discourse on the occasion.

A great sensation has been created by the resignation of the cardinalate by Cardinal Odescalchi, Bishop of Sabina, and Vicar to his holiness at Rome. He left Rome on the night of the 25th or 26th of November, leaving a letter for his brother, the Prince Peter Odescalchi, not to be opened till forty-eight hours after his departure. The Cardinal has entered the Noviciate of the Jesuits at Verona.

WATERFORD.—The youthful and beautiful Miss Kirwan was on Thursday received as a nun at the presentation convent in Waterford. The postulante was led to the altar by two of her sisters in religion, preceded by the nuns of the community according to their rank, and four lovely children dressed in white, bearing lighted tapers and baskets of flowers.—*Atlas*, June 15.

Cardinal Fesch, Archbishop of Lyons died at Rome, on the 13th May last, at 5 o'clock in the morning. He was the maternal uncle of Napoleon, was born at Ajaccio, in Corsica, on the 3d of January, 1763, and died in his seventy-sixth year, possessor of one of the finest cabinets of pictures in the world, which, with his valuable library, he has bequeathed to the city of Lyons.

Printed by Messrs. W. Rushton and Co., Calcutta, for the Proprietors, price one rupee per month, or ten rupees per annum in advance. To non-subscribers 8 annas per number.

THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

'One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.'

No. VIII.

AUGUST 24, 1839.

VOL. I.

We omitted to state in our last that letters from England, received by the Overland Mail, mention the gratifying intelligence that the REVD. MR. CHADWICK is perfectly restored to health, and that he is returning to Calcutta in the *Plantagenet*, which sailed on the 13th June, accompanied by four Professors for the College of St. Xavier. The names of the gentlemen are MESSRS. SCULLY, SHEA, COOPER AND WELD; the latter is a nephew of the late eminent and truly pious man, CARDINAL WELD, and cousin to LORD CLIFFORD who, as some of our readers are aware, has of late years taken a very lively and warm interest in the propagation of the Catholic Religion in India.

The following is a short extract from one of Mr. Sheil's Parliamentary speeches, in which he passes a beautiful and eloquent eulogium on the pious and self-denying priesthood of Ireland, whose characters are so frequently vilified by the enemies of our religion, but of whom it has been justly observed that when misery presses hard upon the Irish peasant, he has one friend, one only friend—the priest. When distress wrings his soul, he has one comforter, one only comforter—the priest. When crime covers him with disgrace and consigns him to punishment—when his heart sinks within him at the apprehension of man's vengeance, and with the terror of God's wrath he has one consoler, only one consoler—the priest. When famine stalks abroad and his children wail in starvation, there is one incessant in collecting the means of life, one only, one incessant collector—the priest. When pestilence invades the land and brings desertion of friends and agony and death—there is—there is still one who does not forsake him living, nor desert him dying—who stretches upon his straw, impregnated with infection, and pours the last words of Christian comfort upon that dying breath, from which in return he inhales disease, and perishes the Martyr of Duty, of Charity, and of God—the Priest, the Priest!

'The priesthood of Ireland had an influence over the people of Ireland, and wherefore should they not? They are the ministers of a religion, endeared by suffering, and fastened by persecution, to the affections of the country. They superadd to the influence which is derived from their sacerdotal authority the still better sway which is drawn from their apostolic conduct. If their dogmas go beyond (as some may imagine), their lives are within the limits of

the Gospel. There is no variance—no wide gap between their habits and their inculcation. There are no diamonds in their mitres, nor gold on their crostiers. If they are Samaritans in belief, they are not Pharisees in sensibility. They live with the poor, and they feel for them. They are their friends, their benefactors, their companions. If they admonish them with a parental strenuousness, they sympathize with them with more than a fraternal kindness. They are the trustees of their little interests, the depositaries of their humble solitudes; they give them solace in sorrow, food in famine, medicine in disease; they are the sentinels of the death-bed; and in the hovel that reeks with pestilence and steams with death, they take their fearless stand, and minister to agony, at the hazard of their own lives, its last and most precious consolation. If at the dead of the winter midnight a knock should come to the door of the Catholic priest, and he should be told that one of those who are committed to his spiritual care lies at the point of death, in need of his immediate succour, does he turn him in a bed of down, and wrap himself in the warmth and snugness of his rectorial sinecurism, that he may dream of another benefice? No; he goes forth with a celerity to which a genuine piety gives wings, though the rain should fall in torrents on his head, and (I do not exaggerate) the snow should beat against his face; through many a lonely glen, and through many a deep morass, he makes his way. He arrives at the habitation of expiring wretchedness,—he places himself in perilous contact with breath that exhales mortality,—receives from poisoned lips the secret of the over-burdened heart,—converts despair to hope,—and waits that hope to heaven; and if this be true,—and who will say that it is not true?—is it matter for wonder (reality has supplied the colours of that picture which I have thus boldly painted),—is it, I say, a matter for astonishment that men like these should have an influence over the opinions, a sway over the feelings, a domination over the nation's heart?

We are informed on very good authority that the HOLY SEE has determined on increasing the number of Catholic Bishops in England from four to eight, and that it is proposed to appoint a Bishop for the four Northern Counties, viz. Cumberland, Westmoreland, Northumberland, and Durham; another for Yorkshire, and to unite Lancashire, and Cheshire into one Vicariate. What a conclusive evidence of the alarming increase of *Popery*!

PERSECUTION IN COCHIN CHINA.

In every age, since her divine foundation, the *Catholic Church* has received fresh glory and lustre from the triumphs of her martyrs. History abounds with the most sublime and affecting accounts of the admirable constancy, patience and fortitude, with which they endured the most cruel, and excruciating torments which human ingenuity could invent or fiendish malignity inflict. What the primitive Churches suffered, the newly planted Church of Indo-China is now suffering. The Devil set all his engines to work, that he might detain in his captivity those great nations which lay yet buried in the darkness of infidelity; but all the machinations of Hell have not been able to *defeat* the Divine Mercy, and pious Missionaries filled with the spirit of the Apostles, armed with the power of God, have baffled obstacles which seemed insurmountable to flesh and blood. By their patience, zeal, charity, mortification, humility and all other Apostolic virtues, those vessels of the Gospel, triumphantly planted the standard of the Cross in countries previously unknown to us.

The Catholic faith was first preached in the kingdom of Cochin-China in the beginning of the seventeenth century, and from that period has continu-

ed to make rapid progress, but as the work of God does not advance without meeting obstacles and difficulties, the new converts were often exposed to cruel persecutions. One of the most cruel and long continued is that which began on the 6th of January 1833, under the edict of the EMPEROR MINH MANG, and is still raging with dreadful fury, so that God alone knows, when it shall end. A great number of Christians of all ages and sexes after being cruelly beaten, and tortured in various ways, have been either beheaded or banished. Many of the young converts, have borne the severest tortures with incredible constancy, rather than discover where the priests lay hid; or trample on the cross, or deliver up religious books, or in a word, do any thing contrary to the Law of God, or which would imply the least disavowal of their faith. But as in the field of the Lord, the cockle is oversowed among the wheat; the Church of Cochin-China must lament the apostasy of many members.

The first Martyr in Tonquin was Paul Tuy, a native priest, who was apprehended on the 25th June 1833, while he was administering the sacraments to a sick person. The Mandarin who wished to save him advised him to say, that he was a physician, but he preferred death to a falsehood, and confessed that he was a priest; he was in consequence beheaded on the 11th of October 1833, and in the sixty-first year of his age.

In Cochin-China the first Martyr was the Revd. Isidore Gagelin, a French Missionary. Although he had surrendered himself to the Mandarin with the view of soliciting the King's permission to retire from his kingdom, yet he was strangled as a preacher of the religion of Jesus Christ, on the 17th of October 1833.

The most celebrated Martyr among the laymen was PAUL BU'O'NG, a Captain in the Imperial Guard. He was apprehended in the month of December 1832, with six soldiers of the same guard. They were several times tortured in order to compel them to renounce their religion. One of the six soldiers died in prison, the rest were banished and Paul being their chief, was beheaded on the 23d October 1833, on the site of a church which had been pulled down, and opposite to the house of his daughter, married to Thaddeus Quó'n, who, as also her father-in-law, was in prison on account of the Catholic Faith. The Revd. Mr. Jaccard, whom many may remember to have seen in Calcutta in the year 1824, and the Revd. Father Odorico, an Italian Friar, of the order of St. Francis, both Missionaries in Cochin-China, were banished to the mountains of AI-LAO, on the 3d of December 1833. The latter unable to bear the unhealthiness of the country, died on the 25th May. 1834.

On the 30th of Nov. 1835, the feast of St. Andrew the Apostle, the Revd. Mr. Marchand, a French Missionary, after suffering the most barbarous cruelties, such as the application of the red-hot irons to his body, the tearing off his flesh with pincers, was condemned to be beheaded, but he died immediately after the executioner had lacerated the calves off his legs.

On the 27th August 1837, another French Missionary, the Rev. Mr. Cornay, in Tonquin, was cruelly tortured and beheaded for preaching the Catholic Faith.

But in the year 1838 the Emperor Minh Mang carried the persecution to the last degree of cruelty, as will be seen by the following extract of a letter, dated Upper Cochin-China, 3d January, 1839.

'The year 1838, has been for us a year of calamity and desolation; and for Tonquin and Upper Cochin-China one of misery and tribulation. The sword of persecution has made great havoc in the vineyard of the Lord; heaven has

been peopled with holy martyrs, but there have been likewise some apostates, and all together the Christian religion in these regions is placed in serious danger. Two Spanish Dominican Bishops were arrested, one was beheaded and the other died in his cage, last July; three Spanish Clergymen of the same order and of the Tonquinese Mission, were also arrested and beheaded for professing the Catholic faith; seven indigenous Priests (four of the Dominican Mission, and three of the French) were likewise arrested and beheaded for the true faith. All these generous Confessors and Martyrs have decorated the Church of God in Tonquin, and done honor to the Mission, by the courage, firmness and constancy they exhibited in the midst of their tortures, and by the noble-mindedness and resignation with which they shed their blood, and gave up their life for the Christian religion, and the faith of Jesus Christ. Monsignor Harvard of the Diocese of Rennes, Bishop of Castoria, and Vicar-Apostolic of Western Tonquin, died last July of sickness, brought on by excess of misery and fatigue: his Lordship was only three days ill. I have been told that Monsieur Simonin expired during his flight in the mountains, but I have not received an official account of his death. We also have had a furious attack here in Upper Cochinchina, on account of a small College we had founded. Monsieur Candalh a French Missionary, was at the head of the little establishment, but the people of the district, not having taken sufficient precautions, nor acted with sufficient prudence, the Pagans came to know the whole, and in order to obtain money, threatened immediately to give information to the Mandarin; but having no hopes of gaining any, they gave information that the district contained a European Priest, an indigenous one, a College, &c. Whereupon a Mandarin proceeded thither with three hundred soldiers, and the next morning by day-break surrounded the village. Mr. Candalh and the indigenous Priest were enabled to flee, and make their escape: all the Chiefs of the place were arrested; were put to the cangue, were conducted to the head-quarters of the province, underwent the interrogatory, but being overcome by the dreadful torture inflicted on them, they had the weakness and misfortune to apostatize.

A young élève of Mr. Candalh's, named Dominic Thiên, a lad of eighteen, was the only one among them that confessed the faith to the end; he suffered every sort of torment, and nobly aspired to the crown of Martyrdom. Mr. Candalh suffered incredible hardships and privations in eluding the pursuit of the soldiers and Pagans; worn out at length with misery and languor, as well as exhausted with hunger, he expired on the mountains of Upper Cochinchina, on the 26th of last July. Mr. Viale, another French Missionary, expired also on the mountains, exhausted by sickness and misery, on the 17th of last December. Mr. Jaccard was involved in this slaughter through the odium and malevolence of a Mandarin, and especially of the King, who had been for a long time seeking for a pretext to do away with him, so that this noble confessor after the cruellest tortures was strangled on the 21st of September, (Saint Mathew's day,) with the lad Dominic Thiên.

Monsieur Borrie, the French Missionary in Tonquin, and two Tonquinese Priests belonging to the same French Mission, had been arrested, and have suffered Martyrdom; the former having been beheaded, and the two latter strangled for the faith, on the 24th of November last.

Upper Cochinchina is by no means in peace, all there is disturbance and confusion; all the clergy are dispersed and concealed; all the Nunneries broken up. I have lately heard a melancholy piece of news. A Chinese vessel was lost in the beginning of December, to the north of Upper Cochinchina; some persons saw the ship at sea stationary, and without sails; she appeared a complete wreck, and all hands seemed to have perished. There floated on shore staves, planks, boxes containing Europe articles, viz. books, pictures, mitres, Episcopal sandals; wine, money, &c. The Heathens seized a great part of those goods, and drank all the wine: the Christians have succeeded in saving very little of any thing. I have sent orders to purchase whatever they can.

The following is a Synopsis of the number that fell victims to this awful persecution :—

R. F. Paulus Thuy.....	June	25th	} 1833.
R. F. Isidores Gagelin.....	Oct.	17th	
Paulus Biù'o'ng.....	Oct.	23d	
R. F. Odorico.....	May	25th	1834.
R. F. Cornay.....	August	27th	1837.
2 Dominican Spanish Bishops	} In July	} 1838.	
3 Dominican (Spanish) Priests			
4 Indigenous Dominican Priests			
3 Indigenous French Priests. .			
1 Priest of Savoy belonging to the French Mission stran- gled in Cochín-China.	} September 21st.		
1 French Priest beheaded in Ton- quin	} November 24th.		
1 Cochín-Chinese Student stran- gled	} September 21st.		
2 Tonquinese Priests strangled,	} November 24th.		

Tot. 22—21 Martyrs and one Confessor.

- 1 French Bishop died of misery in Tonquin.
- 2 French Priests starved on the mountains.

Well, then, may we exclaim : ‘ you are come to Mount Sion, and to the city of the Living God, the Heavenly Jerusalem, and to the Church of the first-born, who are written in the Heavens, and to God the Judge of all, and to the Spirits of the just made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new Testament, and to the sprinkling of blood, which speaketh better than that of Abel. (Heb. xii. 22-24.)

Let us now praise men of renown, and our fathers in their generations. The Lord hath wrought great glory through his magnificence from the beginning Rich-men in virtue, lovers of beautifulness all these have gained glory in their generations, and were praised in their days These were men of mercy, whose godly deeds have not failed. Good things continue with their seed .. Their posterity are a holy inheritance and their seed hath stood in the covenants their name liveth unto generation and generation. Let the people shew forth their wisdom, and the Church declare their praise. (Eccles. cap. xlv.)

Selections.

CONVERSION OF SIR CHARLES WOLSELEY, BART.

On Sunday the 29th of October, there was a grand ceremonial in the singularly beautiful chapel at Tixall, the seat of Sir Clifford Constable, Bart., on occasion of the public profession of the Catholic faith and first communion of Sir Charles Wolseley, in presence of a crowded congregation of his Catholic and Protestant neighbours. Before the celebration of High Mass, which was performed with great splendour, Sir Charles came forward and knelt at the foot of the altar while the Very Rev. Dr. Weedall, officiating in the place of the Right Rev. Dr. Walsh, who was prevented by illness from attending, addressed to him the solemn exhortation appointed in the Roman Ritual to be read at the reception of a convert, and with the rest of the clergy present and the choir, chanted the prayers and psalms prescribed by the church on the occasion. After this he stood up, and with a loud voice, read his abjuration of Protestan-

tism, and made profession of the Catholic faith, in the words of the creed of Pope Pious IV. Having been then solemnly received into the Church, he retired to the Gallery whence he again approached the altar towards the conclusion of Mass, and devoutly received the first communion. The scene altogether was very imposing. There were present several priests from the neighbourhood, and upwards of 500 people. An admirable sermon, was preached by the Hon. and Rev. George Spencer. The whole ceremonial was grand and striking in a high degree, and has produced a great sensation in the neighbourhood.—*Catholic Magazine*, Dec. 1837.

THE HON. AND REV. MR. SPENCER'S SERMONS.

1. *Sermon preached at the Opening of the Church of our Lady of Mount St. Bernard, on Wednesday the 11th of October, 1837.*

2. *Sermon Preached at the Catholic Chapel at Tixall, Staffordshire, on Sunday the 29th of October 1837, on occasion of Sir Charles Wolseley, Baronet, making his public profession of the Catholic Faith.*

Whether we consider the occasions upon which these discourses were delivered, the objects which gave rise to them, or the rank and former *status* of the highly gifted preacher, as a member of the church of England, on the one hand and the character and station of this illustrious convert, on the other; no events have taken place in the country within our memory, of a nature so well calculated to make an impression upon the minds of reflecting Protestants than those which the Sermons in question, were intended to commemorate. It is, indeed, refreshing, after our long night of proscription, to hear of such exhilarating scenes as those witnessed on the 11th and 26th days of October; and to find that, in England, once more, the glories of the ancient faith are reviving, and attracting the kindly notice of our separated brethren. Who, even the most sanguine, could have supposed, some twenty or thirty years ago, that the splendid ceremony, at Mount St. Bernard, would have taken place so publicly, and without molestation, in the very heart of England, or that one of the great of the land, nurtured in error, would be found, with nerve sufficient, to brave the scoffs of bigotry, and openly proclaim before the eyes of Protestant Britain his conversion to the Catholic faith? Such an occurrence as the conversion of so distinguished an individual as Sir Charles Wolseley is of great importance at any time; but there is a circumstance connected with the Hon. Baronet's abjuration which gives it a peculiar interest in our eyes—the singular spectacle of a converted minister of the established church of England, the brother of a Peer formerly holding a high place in the Government, congratulating from the pulpit his brother convert upon the renunciation of his errors. Facts like these are worth a thousand arguments to the mass who are guided more by example than by precept. Without entering into the various points in controversy, which are too abstruse for the bulk of mankind, most inquirers after truth will be more influenced in their determination, to adopt the course pursued by such men as Mr. Spencer and Sir Charles Wolseley, from the example thus set them than by the soundest logical deductions. Authority is the basis on which religion rests, yet how few are there, who, in their search after truth, adopt this rule. Most of those who reach this haven, arrive by devious ways and they then wonder that they had not followed the obvious course, which lay before them, in not giving themselves up at once to the direction of those faithful pilots, whom Jesus Christ has appointed to conduct the faithful in safety through the shoals and quicksands of error. But to return to our text.

The Sermons before us are beautiful compositions, and, what is better far, breathe the most exalted and pious sentiments; such as we would have expected from the apostolic zeal and fervent devotion of the honourable and reverend orator. There is something peculiarly pathetic and interesting, when Mr. Spencer alludes to his own conversion, as he does, both in the preface to

his first Sermon, and in the Sermon itself. Referring to the interesting circumstances under which that discourse was delivered, he says:—

‘To these circumstances I alluded, when I endeavoured to express what, at least, ought to be, and what I hope, in some degree, are my sentiments of deep gratitude to the God of all mercy, for having led me to admire and to love that holy religion, and all the sacred institutions connected with it, which once were the objects of my vain opposition; but I wish further to record, that it was while on a visit to the noble-minded youth,* to whom these sheets are inscribed, nearly eight years ago, in this very county, where now we meet as brethren, associated in zealously promoting the same holy cause, the merits of which we were then discussing, that my mind was fully opened to acknowledge the errors of my former ways, and to embrace the faith, of which I am now an unworthy, but devoted servant. It was the example of his amiable zeal for the Catholic religion, and the force of his talented and animated conversation, which, during that week, to me, of ever blessed recollection, finally overcame the opposition which my early prejudices had, till then, made to my reception of the bright beams of truth; and I joyfully embrace this occasion of returning him, before the world, a tribute of that gratitude for so signal a benefit, of which the value, I humbly trust, may be more perfectly understood by us both hereafter, in the blessed light of the glory of God.’

The following are the Preacher’s allusions to his own case, in reference to his ideas, whilst a Protestant, as to the religious orders. In answer to every calumny, we would merely say, read the ensuing extract.

‘Against no portion of our holy Church has the enemy of truth raised more grievous calumnies, and let loose more bitter opposition, than against her religious orders; and I remember the time when I believed these calumnies, and thought it right to foster these prejudices in myself and others. What thanks can I return to Almighty God for having delivered me from the errors in which I was involved? I can do no less than exert myself with all my powers to undeceive others of my brethren who are still possessed with them: and though I ought not to be counted worthy to stand forth as an advocate of these holy institutions, which I formerly in my ignorance condemned; and though another would, in many ways, more adequately fulfil the task which is laid on me, yet I undertake it in the hope, that the very circumstance of my having once been of the same mind with themselves, may give weight to what I shall say, with these whose education has disposed them hitherto to look with suspicion and dread on the very name of a monastery, and who have not yet wholly shaken off their early feelings. I once used to visit monasteries in other countries from curiosity; and, depend on the account which I had read and heard from their enemies, I looked on them as nurseries of idleness and superstition, and on their devout inhabitants as men without virtue. If now I consider these men as the chosen ones of God; if now I visit their abodes with delight and eagerness, to gain for myself some spiritual refreshment, as it were to gather the crumbs which fall from their table; if I now count it one of my best privileges to be enrolled in the number of those friends for whom they offer up their prayers, it is not that I have been hurried away into these new sentiments by circumstances which have affected my feelings and imagination, without taking time for deliberate reflection. No, I have struggled against my present impressions to defend my former prejudices, and have given way to the power of truth when I could no longer resist.’

The explanation of the evangelical counsels, given by Mr. Spencer, is one of the clearest we ever read; as is the distinction he draws between these and the precepts or commandments of the Gospel.

‘The counsels of the Gospel, my brethren, are distinguished, in the Catholic Church, from the precepts or commandments of the Gospel; and the two expressions sufficiently explain what the distinction is. The precepts of the Gospel mean all those holy laws which Jesus Christ has laid on all his disciples

* Mr. Ambrose L. Phillips.

without exception. Now, whatever Jesus Christ has thus commanded, we all are obliged to obey, and we cannot disobey even in one point without incurring the anger of Almighty God. But there are other things which we may do to please God, which he will magnificently reward, but which, nevertheless, are not necessary to be done by each. These things, we say in the language of the Church, Jesus Christ does not command, but counsel or advise to be done; and though we say not, cursed is he that does them not; yet we say, blessed, thrice blessed, is he that does them. The chief of such works as these are included in what are called the three evangelical counsels; which are, Voluntary Poverty; Perpetual Chastity; and Entire Obedience. I must speak of these in detail, and, in doing so, show you how the principle which I have explained agrees with the word of God.

As to the counsel of Voluntary Poverty, the Catholic religion teaches that no man is obliged, by the law of God, to embrace it. A man who inherits wealth from his ancestors, or who acquires it honestly by his industry or superior talents, sins not in retaining and using what he possesses, provided he remembers, in the use of it, that he is yet but a steward of Almighty God, and so does good to his poor brethren out of his abundance, employs his power in the world, not to oppress, but to defend the weak, and fulfils the other duties belonging to his state. This, we find, is intimated by St. Paul, who, in directing Timothy how to conduct the rich among his flock, does not insist that they should sacrifice their wealth, but only that they should use it well. 'Charge,' he says, 'the rich in this world, not to be high-minded, nor to trust in the uncertainty of riches, but in the living God. To do good, to be rich in good works, to give easily, to communicate to others, to lay up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on the true life.' A man therefore, possessed of great riches may, by a right use of them, lay hold on the true life; but, yet our Lord, in the text of my discourse, points out a more excellent way; and this text I choose, because it exhibits, with peculiar strength, the truth of Catholic principles on the subject of evangelical counsels. A young man comes to Christ, and asks what good thing he must do to be saved. The Lord tells him, 'If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments,' which he then enumerates particularly. The young man answers that so far he had already gone, but he felt an impulse within him to do something more. 'All these have I kept from my youth, what is yet wanting to me?' Our Lord replies, 'If thou wilt be perfect, go sell what thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven, and come, follow me.' No argument, I think, can shew more clearly than this simple narrative, the truth of our doctrine, that what is required of all men for salvation, is to cease from evil and do good, according to the rule of God's holy law, of which the whole substance is comprised in the practice of the three virtues of faith, hope and charity. But that there is a virtue of a higher order to be attained by those who aspire to perfection, and that to this some souls are specially called by our Lord. What we see here in regard to the renouncing of worldly goods and embracing holy poverty for God's sake, we shall find equally true in the other two counsels of chastity and obedience, as we proceed to shew; and first concerning the former.

The Catholic doctrine on this subject cannot be explained more clearly than it is by St. Paul, from whose writings in different places, we first clearly learn that marriage is an honourable state of life, instituted and blessed by God, in which by a holy life his grace and salvation may be obtained; but that a state of singleness and chastity embraced for God's sake is preferable; and that in this state it is more easy to serve God without distraction, as he says, 'He that is without a wife is solicitous for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please God; but he that is with a wife, is solicitous for the things of the world, how he may please his wife;' and therefore he expresses a wish to his brethren, prompted by his charity, and desire of their greater good, that all men were even as himself, unmarried; but declares, as our Lord also

does in his Gospel, that to enable a man to live worthily in the holy state of continence, there is required a special grace which all men do not receive. Agreeably to these principles, the holy church obliges none to embrace a life of continence; on the contrary, she permits no one to be pledged to this state till after strict trial of his dispositions, and good evidence that he is truly called to it by God, without whose grace, there would be no hope of his continuing pure and constant in his resolution; but she loudly proclaims the superior blessedness of this state; she invites her children to embrace it, and by the holy regulations of her religious orders, she assists vast numbers to live according to its pure spirit, who might, without such aid, have been entangled and lost in the midst of a wicked world. The Holy Fathers speak in admiration of the blessed state of holy continence, in which they declare, that the life of men on earth becomes like to that of the angels of God; but yet of the three counsels of the Gospel, that on which I have last to speak, namely, entire obedience, is the most perfect and excellent. The excellence of this counsel cannot be more clearly shewn than by the example of our divine Lord, who being the great king of heaven and earth, the creator and rightful master of the universe, took on himself of his own free will the form of a servant, and became obedient even unto death. Obedience was the grand object of his love and desire. 'My meat,' he said, 'is to do the will of him that sent me.' To shew farther the importance which is to be attached to this virtue, the spirit of God has recorded in the Scripture, hardly one circumstance of his conduct, during the thirty years which he spent in retirement with his parents, except that he was practising obedience. 'He went down to Nazareth, and was subject to them.' Again, he shews his wonderful love for the virtue of obedience, when recommending it to his disciples, he asks, 'Which is greater, he that sitteth at table, or he that serveth? Is not he that sitteth at table? but I am in the midst of you as he that serveth.' It is this above all which recommends to the lovers of perfection the practice of this virtue, that by the voluntary sacrifice of their own will by obedience they are following, in the most favourite point of his character, the great example of the Son of God.'

The same reasons which made it, in the judgment of Sir Charles Wolseley, and in that of his friends, expedient for him to perform his abjuration of Protestantism and his profession of the Catholic faith, in the most public and marked manner, before those of his own neighbourhood, as Mr. Spencer informs us, induced the latter, with the advice of his Reverend brethren, to print the discourse on the conversion of Sir Charles Wolseley, that, as far as in him lay, this noble conversion might be made the subject of attention and discussion throughout the kingdom. Our limits will not allow us to make more than one extract or two from this other admirable Sermon; but we regret it the less, as we have no doubt both discourses will be very generally read. Our views, which we have long entertained, coincide with those of Mr. Spencer, that, at no very distant day, the bulk of the nation will return to the faith; and we think that the difficulties to conversion, presented in the following extract, are merely temporary. A few more bright examples would remove many barriers.

'Those who have a heart to pray for the things that are for the peace of Jerusalem, cannot but be moved by the signs of the times to ask, shall we see England once more united to the Church of God? What can we answer to this question? Nothing but what the prophet answered, when being placed in spirit in a valley of dry bones, the Lord asked him, son of man dost thou think these bones shall live? Lord thou knowest. Thou knowest Lord whether the ruined habitations of by-gone piety shall again resound with the voice of praise, whether the dust of our religious ancestors shall again revive in a generation worthy of them. All that we can say is, that it shall be done as the Lord pleases, and that whatever pleases him, to that we will bow, and in that we will rejoice. The natural movement of our hearts must needs be, in the first place, to pray that the truth may be again brought in peace under the hands of their true shepherd; but if this is not to be, if yet as heretofore,

R.

the embracing of the true faith is to be accompanied with the endurance of ill will, calumny, contempt ; even if days of bloody persecution are to return, we can and will be thankful in this case ; and adore with gladness the just and true judgments of God, who knows from whom to withdraw his graces, of which they have been proved unworthy, and whom to select among their fellows as vessels of mercy ; men who have stood firm in the midst of general apostacy, and are worthy to receive from the hands of their enemies the never-fading crown of martyrdom.

‘ We know not, I say, what we are to look for in the prospect of the future ; but we can say that the crisis at which we are now arrived is most interesting ; our circumstances now being such as give a happy prospect of seeing, before long, the body of the nation return to the faith, while there is yet so much difficulty attending a true conversion, as makes it an occasion of a glorious triumph over the enemies of our souls. The violence and the power of the church’s adversaries have already been so far diminished, that the truth is no longer hidden from the eyes of any who are disposed to look for it. Whoever will may, without concealment, converse with Catholics, and even with their clergy ; they may thus easily examine the church’s claims to their obedience ; they may safely witness her holy ceremonies, and be present at the instructions given from her pulpits ; and hence there are in every part of the kingdom individuals who already flock in considerable numbers into her fold. But on the other hand, we will thank God, that the embracing of the faith is yet beset with so many and such severe difficulties, as to give good confidence, that they who do join themselves to us, are faithful indeed, and have none but pure motives to impel them to this step. What a difficulty meets them at the very outset. It is proposed to an Englishman to examine the truth of Catholicity. His pride will immediately be awakened ; and he asks, am I then to question the soundness of all the principles which I have maintained from my infancy ? Am I to think of unrooting all the feelings which have been interwoven with my very nature, and which form the very groundwork of all my claims to self-approbation ? He may look into the subject as a matter of mere speculation and curiosity, without much difficulty ; but when he once perceives the nature of our reasonings, and sees that he will, if he continues to enquire, be unavoidably led to think himself to have been altogether in error ; however sweet are the feelings with which the acknowledgement of past errors is immediately rewarded when once the sacrifice is made, few have wisdom to understand this ; great is the number of those who are thrown back at this first step, in their progress towards the Church, and these usually are turned into her most violent enemies, and become leaders in the company of those who labour to obstruct against others the avenues of truth. But suppose a man has passed this point ; has opened his mind to conviction, and now sees that the ancient church, however calumniated, is still true and beautiful ; to proclaim his new sentiments before men is a yet more arduous step. Satan cares not for his holding the faith in his heart, if he can keep it from his mouth ; for with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. At this point then he sets all his forces in array, and threatens war. The convert sees before him, not indeed in our day, fire and sword ; but a host of lesser dangers meet his view in exaggerated forms ; as the loss of his trade, the estrangement and reproaches of his friends, the astonishment and grief of his own family, the contempt of the world, who will esteem him nothing better than a madman ; and if he be under the authority of others, a lengthened petty persecution, which though it may be perhaps endured for a time, it may seem impossible to bear long without being worn out. He now has to associate his name with those whom from his childhood he has been taught to look upon as a poor contemptible set of men, whom it had been the chief glory of England to have cast out and trodden down ; and however in his calm reflections he may perceive that his country’s disgrace is that very rejection of the ancient faith, on which she has so blindly founded her claims to honour, yet when deliberating on the decided step of renouncing for ever the name of Protestant, and himself bearing

the proscribed degraded name of Papist, human infirmity puts this with all his other fears before him, in the darkest colours, and it is a stout heart, or rather it is a powerful grace, which alone can make him stand this test. But, moreover, he has during his enquiries learnt what new duties he must undertake to practise as a Catholic, and however sweet these are to those who have tasted their consolation, they are to human nature, as it is in itself, revolting. How can he submit to reveal to one of those men, whom he has been used to consider insignificant and despicable, if not crafty and dangerous persons, the deepest dearest secrets of his heart? How can he begin the new, untried work of interior spiritual discipline, and set himself to put aside his own opinions and his own inclinations, and to govern all his thoughts, words, and actions by the precepts of religion, and this in a religion, which he is not permitted to modify, and adapt to his own judgment and taste, but of which the principles are fixed and invariable, which exacts complete obedience, and allows no evasion?"

We cannot resist extracting the following beautiful passage in relation to the illustrious convert.

'The distinguished person who has now declared himself before the world the humble follower of Jesus Christ, and a member of his holy church, you who hear me, have known a longer time than I have. You know the family of which he is the head, to be one of the most ancient and honourable, not only of your county, but of the kingdom. Himself you have known as one who, in maintaining those political principles, and supporting those public measures which he judged conducive to the just liberty and happiness of his countrymen and neighbours, has zealously exerted the influence of his rank and property, and willingly exposed himself to persecution, loss, and even imprisonment. In his private life, while yet a member of the Protestant church, he has been distinguished for stedfastly opposing the tide of religious prejudice, and although he, like the rest of our countrymen, had been taught from his infancy to view the faith of Catholics through a distorted medium, unlike too many of them, he has not refused to open his eyes to their true principles, whenever circumstances have put him in the way of information; seeing them harshly attacked he hath stood forth as an impartial judge between them and their adversaries; he has publicly defended them against his own partizans; when he has found them to be unjustly condemned, and when he has seen them exposed to difficulties and affronts, he has loved to console their heart by his benefits and kindness. He sought for no return for his good offices. In earthly goods they had none to give; and he, while enjoying the consciousness of upright and benevolent intentions, did not perceive the great thing which was yet wanting to make him truly happy; for nothing can be called happiness without the light of true faith. But those whom he had supported and consoled, knew his wants; and out of their poverty they have repaid him with better things than he had imparted to them, by calling on their heavenly Father to open his treasures, and enrich their benefactor with those goods, the value of which he had not yet fully known. His good works, and the prayers of the faithful were had in remembrance in the sight of God; and by his grace he has learnt to fear those dangers of which the world is insensible and to aspire after those treasures which the world despises; and having found that pearl of great price he has shewn himself willing to give his all to purchase it.

'It has not pleased God to call on him as yet for sacrifices so painful or so costly, as we all must be prepared willingly to offer if occasion comes; yet by the manner in which he has pursued his course thus far, we judge what he is prepared to do; we anticipate what he yet will do for the honour of God, if his life be prolonged. For we look upon it as no small thing for a man of rank who has spent a long life, and maintained an honourable place in the high circles of earthly fashion, now in his advanced years, to submit himself, with the docility of a little child, to the Pastors of the church, and receive from them instructions in religious duties, which, to the lovers of the world,

are foolish and contemptible; and to do this, not as it might be done, in secret, so as to escape observation, but openly before his neighbours, to defy the world's opinion.'

CATHOLICISM IN IRELAND.

(From the Catholic Magazine.)

Next to the miraculous spread of the Gospel in the early ages of the church, there is not, perhaps, a greater phenomenon in ecclesiastical history, than the preservation of the ancient faith in our sister isle. In our view, the undying Catholicism of Ireland presents one of the most glorious spectacles ever exhibited by any Christian nation; and, if all other proofs for the infallibility of the church were to fail, we should appeal with triumph to the history of the Irish church, as affording *per se* one of the strongest proofs that could be adduced for that infallibility. In our eyes the struggles, noble as they are, which the Irish people have made, and are daily making, for liberty, sink into insignificance, when compared with the mighty efforts they have made, under the most galling oppression, to preserve their ancient faith, clinging to it with a fidelity and zeal worthy of such a holy cause.

It is not our intention to pourtray the horrors of the penal code, which are too well known to require any illustration at our hands, nor, when these failed to accomplish the extirpation of the faith, to notice the nefarious arts which were set in motion to seduce the people of Ireland from the creed of her saints and of her martyrs. No! We wish to forget in the midst of our joy at the bright prospect now before us, that such things were; and we only desire to call them to remembrance that we may enjoy with greater exultation the pleasing anticipations of the triumphs of the faith. In looking back at the past history of Ireland, when the dark clouds of persecution hovered over her, and comparing it with what she now is and will soon be, what Catholic heart, alive to the interests of religion, will not throb with joy and at once acknowledge, that in her sufferings and in her emancipation from a worse than Egyptian bondage, he recognizes the finger of a kind and merciful God! Gloomy indeed was long the prospect, but the ark of the Covenant was preserved, and the Catholic religion now raises its majestic and venerable head, in the green isle, encircled with its ancient glories, and the trials and victories of eighteen centuries.

Yet after all, the phenomenon which we have witnessed in the history of the Irish church, is merely in appearance. With God all things are possible, and HIS will that HIS church should be eternal at once solves the extraordinary problem we have glanced at. In the promise made by Jesus Christ, that he would build HIS church upon a rock, and that the gates of hell should not prevail against her, we have both the security and the pledge for its fulfilment. Had the faith sown in Ireland been the produce of human wisdom, it could not have withstood the withering and destructive blasts which assailed it; but divine in its origin, it has outlived their fury, and is producing its perennial fruits.

But without departing from his promise, God might have removed the lamp of the faith for a time from the Irish nation, as he did from other countries three centuries ago. HE was pleased in his good and wise dispensation, however, not to do so, as if to try the fidelity of the Irish people, and well have they proved it. It is in this fidelity that we discern the noblest trait in the Irish character; for, amid trials and privations, which would have shaken the constancy of most nations, they clung to the true faith with an attachment which gained new strength with every fresh effort to shake it. Had the people of Ireland succumbed to the spiritual yoke of their oppressors, the light of the faith would probably have been almost extinguished in Great Britain; but in preserving that precious deposit, they have been the means, in the hands of Providence, of contributing in some degree to the resuscitation of the ancient

faith on this side of St. George's channel. It is thus that God has made the wrath of man conduce to his own praise. Persecuted in their own country, and unable, from the evils of mis-government, to earn a subsistence in a land teeming with plenty, numbers of the unfortunate children of Erin landed upon our shores in search of the freedom and comfort denied them in their fatherland. With their religion they brought along with them a feeling of industry, and the result was, that, in a few years, the Irish population formed one of the most important elements in the composition of our manufacturing districts; and wherever there was a demand for labour, Irishmen were always found ready to offer their services. Without their labour we doubt whether Glasgow would have reached its manufacturing eminence: the basin of the Union Canal, which has saved to the inhabitants of Edinburgh a sum of about £100,000 per annum on the single article of coal, was scooped out principally by the hands of Irishmen: Irish labourers, to use the expression of a dignitary of the English church, have carried the half of London on their backs, and our railroads afford another proof of their active industry.

We have said that the Irish emigrants have brought their religion along with them. To have expected that they would abandon the faith of their fathers on settling on a strange soil would, after the arduous struggles they encountered in its maintenance at home, have indeed been absurd. The means of spiritual instruction, formerly very limited in Great Britain, were soon found quite inadequate to meet the increasing wants occasioned by the great influx of Irish, and it became necessary to meet the exigency by erecting additional chapels, and increasing the number of ecclesiastical students. But important as those erections and the increase are, in reference to the actual wants of the Catholic population, they are also important in another point of view. In religion, as in secular affairs, much depends upon effect. Protestants, who have never witnessed the dignity and splendour of the Catholic worship, were apt, from what they were accustomed to see in our homely chapels some twenty or thirty years ago, to regard the Catholics as a poor despised sect, afraid to shew themselves in open day; but the case is now widely different. No churches are frequented better by strangers than ours, and the results are such as every lover of truth must rejoice at. Conversions are of frequent, almost of daily occurrence, and the only question now is, how to provide for this increasing accession to our ranks. In our last we proposed a plan to meet the difficulty, arising from a want of funds, but we have little hope of seeing it put to the test; not, we are sure, from any want of zeal on the part of the bishops and their clergy, but from other causes, to which we may perhaps advert on a future occasion.

We now return to Ireland and view the rising grandeur of her church in her seven millions of worshippers. Having come out of the wilderness whither she had taken refuge from the face of the destroyer, her faithful priests are raising her temples and her altars. The sounds of the implements of the artificers employed in erecting these her trophies, are heard on every side; and many of the followers of the rejected creed, join the ranks of the faithful. Already are to be seen stately piles consecrated to the true religion, the problematical erection of which a few years ago, would have been regarded as a dream in many a district and town in Ireland where formerly no Catholic dared to attend publicly the solemn services of his religion; and the day is not far distant when the land of St. Patrick will be covered as before with temples, in which the clean oblation foretold by the prophet, will be offered up. Let us then be glad and rejoice at the cheering prospect before us, and while we exult in our triumph let us not forget our dear countrymen, who are held still captive in the chains of error; but pray earnestly to God to send them a speedy deliverance.

INTELLIGENCE.

SCOTLAND.—CATHOLIC MISSION IN PERTHSHIRE.—To those who are acquainted with the actual state of destitution of the Catholic Church in Scotland, the

following exposition will be unnecessary ; but as the Catholics of England know little of the great wants of their brethren in the faith in the former kingdom, and particularly of those who are located in the wilds and glens of the far-famed Caledonia, we deem it our duty to lay before them a document which cannot fail to excite their sympathy, and induce them to lend a helping hand to the zealous and enterprising missionary who is about to appear amongst them in the good work which he contemplates. ' A simple exposition of the actual state of this extensive charge, cannot fail to interest in its behalf all who value the blessings of religion. This Mission, then, extends from south to north 46 miles, and 61 from east to west, making a total of 2346 square miles. Besides many minor stations where occasional visits have to be made, it includes Perth, Kinross, Errol, Cupar-Angus, Glenisla, Alyth, Blairgowrie, Dunkeld, Strath-Tay, Glenlioni, and Crieff. There are Catholics scattered along the banks of the Earn, the Tay, the black-water, and the Isla. In the whole range there is but one chapel, and but one clergyman. From Perth (the principal station) Cupar and Errol are distant about eleven miles, Dunkeld and Blairgowrie, fifteen, Alyth, Kinross and Crieff seventeen, Glenisla, Spittal of Glenshee and Glenlioni from thirty-three to thirty-nine miles. The native Catholics are principally the descendants of those who continued attached to the House of Perth. For many years they were the objects of bitter persecution ; and such is still their poverty, that the clergyman has to discharge the whole duties on foot,—an arduous task at any time, but during the winter season attended even with considerable danger. The public will easily perceive the difficulty, and, we may add, the almost impossibility, of the necessary religious assistance being supplied to such a flock by one clergyman, with only one chapel. It is therefore under the most pressing necessity that the Rev. Mr. M'Kay enters upon the severe and painful task of soliciting from the faithful the means to establish one or two more *places of meeting*, for those of the ancient faith who are scattered over the valleys and wilds of Perthshire. Both Protestants and Catholics in Perth bear willing testimony to the extent and difficulties of this Mission, and deeply sympathise with the clergyman, as will be seen by the documents in Mr. M'Kay's possession.

' Such is the accurate statement which our meritorious fellow-labourer has, on our part, to lay before the Brethren of the Faith. In consequence of the countless appeals, indeed, that we know have been, and are daily being made to the Catholic public, we should be almost deterred from submitting to them even this claimant case. But there is a cry that will not be repressed,—it is the cry of pain ! and Heaven knows how heavily our heart is pained at present by the difficulties under which almost every part of our district is labouring. That charity, then, that is *kind and faileth not*, will not blame us for thus seeking, even earnestly seeking, relief from at least a part of our sorrow.

' ANDREW, Bishop of Ceramis,
Vicar Apostolic of the Eastern District of Scotland.'

Edinburgh, 5th January, 1839.

FRANCE.—On Monday, the 3rd of December 1838, the feast of St. Francis Xavier, Abbé Dubois, superior of the Foreign Missions, celebrated high mass in the church of the Missions at Paris, to return thanks to God for the increasing success of the Propagation of the Faith in distant countries. Low mass was afterwards said for the missionaries, and the deceased subscribers. Masses were also said in all the parish churches of Paris, including Chaillot and the Invalids, the same morning, with the same intentions. At Limoges, Lyons, Amiens, Marseilles, and other towns, the like celebration took place.

For the first time since 1789, the meeting of the University at Aix has been celebrated by a solemn religious act. At ten o'clock, A.M. the professors of the faculty of law, and those of the faculty of theology, attended at St. Saviour's, at the mass of the Holy Ghost, which was celebrated by the archbishop. This was preceded by the *veni Creator*. After divine service, the *cortège* repaired to the palace of the University, where in presence of a numerous

auditory, G. Giraud, one of the professors, delivered a discourse, containing an *éloge* of Julien, a celebrated juriconsult, and one of the lights of the University of Aix. The sitting, which was attended by the archbishop, was terminated by a distribution of medals of honor, awarded to the pupils who had most distinguished themselves during the last year.

Some time ago, a sum of two thousand francs was stolen from the coupé of a diligence, in its way from Angoulême to Jarnac. Shortly after, the conductor, who was responsible, received a notification from the curé of St. Martin, near Cognac, to wait upon him, and, to his surprise, was presented with the two thousand francs; which the robber, from remorse, had handed over to the priest.

COMPARATIVE STIPENDS OF FRENCH AND ENGLISH BISHOPS.—The salaries of the prelates of France and England have, within a few months, been determined by the legislative body of each country. The contrast is remarkable.

	£	s.	d.
Cardinal Archbishop, 25,000 francs.....	1,041	13	4
Archbishop of Canterbury.....	15,000	0	0
French Archbishop (ordinary) 15,000 francs.....	625	0	0
Archbishop of York.....	10,000	0	0
Archbishop of Paris, 25,000 francs.....	1,041	13	4
Bishop of London.....	10,000	0	0
French Bishop (ordinary) 10,000 francs.....	416	13	4
English Bishop (ordinary).....	4,500	0	0

IRELAND.—Mr. Attorney-General Ball was sworn in a Judge of the Common Pleas, Ireland, and Judge Moore retired on his full Salary.—It is said a Clonmel Radical, will be appointed registrar to the new judge; his Lordship is a Roman Catholic and a distinguished Chancery Lawyer—Councillor P. M. Murphy, late assistant Barrister of this county, is gazetted to be Attorney-General of the Cape of Good Hope. We have authority to say that he has declined that lucrative situation.—If he had had accepted it, councillor O'Shaughnessy would be Assistant Barrister of Cavan. Messrs. J. O'Brien, P. Murphy and Monahan, are to be promoted to the rank of Queen's Counsel.—Two Mr. O'Flannagans, Nephews of Chief Baron Wolfe a Catholic are appointed to situations in the Court of Exchequer; the Senior to be his Lordship's registrar: the Junior to the Office of Crier, worth 700£ a year.

On Wednesday, the 3rd of October, a very interesting and imposing ceremony took place in the Presentation Convent, Sexton Street—the reception of Miss Stewart, a young lady of beauty and accomplishments, only three years a convert to the Catholic religion. The Right Rev. Dr. Murphy, in full pontificals, officiated. About forty clergymen, in suitannes and surplices, lined the sanctuary. At 12 o'clock the convent bell announced the approach of the procession. The choir commenced a beautiful hymn; a train of lovely girls in white, having in silver baskets the different parts of the nun's dress, proceeded the truly interesting novice; she then knelt before the bishop, who mentioned that, having been a convert, she had not received confirmation, which he briefly explained and conferred on her; and after receiving her assent to the different questions he put to her she sat down, and a most feeling and eloquent discourse was given on the subject by the Rev. Mr. O'Connor. She then returned in procession to receive the nun's habit, the choir and clergy chanting the appropriate psalm. On her return she, after receiving the white veil from the hands of the bishop, lay prostrate while the *Veni Creator* hymn was being sung; after which she rose, and, embracing the superioress and religious sisters, the procession returned to the convent. All present were highly pleased with the ceremony, so novel in our city, and so solemnly beautiful in itself.—*Limerick Chronicle*.

On the 9th of October Eliza, youngest daughter of William Kenny, Esq. of Craighleigh, made the solemn profession as a nun at the Ursuline convent, near Clare.

Miss Aylward, of Battyhall, in the county of Kilkenny, lately made solemn profession as a nun in the Presentation Convent, Castlecomer. The

Right Rev. Dr. Kinsella officiated, the clergy of Castlecomer and the neighbouring parishes being in attendance.

On Tuesday, the 30th of October, Miss Delaney, a postulant of the Convent of the Sisters of Mercy, at Charleville, was advanced to the white veil. This affecting and deeply impressive rite took place in the public chapel, and was performed with all due solemnity by the Very Rev. Thomas Croke, P.P. who had been deputed to officiate on the occasion by the Right Rev. prelate of the diocese.

Three Protestants have been lately received into the Catholic Church, in Charleville.

HOLLAND.—On the 26th of February a new Catholic church was commenced at Leyden. It is to be in the Gothic style, and to supply the French station formerly served by the Carmelites of the Vaugirard at Paris. The church will cost 63,000 florins, and is the third Catholic church constructed in Leyden since 1834. The first cost 70,000 florins, and the second about 100,000.

The Recollects of Amsterdam are at present erecting a fine Gothic church with two towers. At the Hague, the Jesuits and the Recollects also intend to build churches. Many churches are contemplated in the country districts, where the zeal of the laity even surpasses that of the clergy.

FLOWERS FROM THE HOLY FATHERS.

No. IV.

Omnia habemus in Christo, et omnia Christus est in nobis. Si vulnus curare desideras, medicus est. Si febris æstus, fons est ! Si gravis iniquitate, justitia est ! Si auxilio indiges, virtus est ! Si mortem times, vita est ! Si cælum desideras, via est ! Si tenebras fugis, lux est ! Si cibum quæris, alimentum est !—*St. Joan. Chrysostomi Exam. lib. 6. cap. 4.*

SAY, art thou weak, feeble, weak ?
In Jesus thy Physician seek ?
Does fever strike, or parching thirst ?
He is thy Fountain, best and first ;
Or, art thou bowed beneath sin's load ?
He is thy Justice—fly to God ;
Does soul or body sickness thrall ?
He is the health of both—and all.

List ye for help ? Be not afraid,
He is thy near and ready aid ;
Does death affright thee drawing near ?
He is thy life—and wherefore fear ?
Long you for heaven's eternal day ?
Walk boldly on—He is the way ;
He is thine aid—His life was given
To ope for thee the gates of heaven.

If thou would fly the mists of night,
The Sun of Justice is thy light ;
He bids the tongue-tied spirit speak—
Unites it in Confession meek :
Or seek ye food ?—He gives thee bread,
Thou art by heavenly Manna fed ;
* Oh, hidden God, what harm can fall—
He gives himself—He gives thee all.

* ' Vere tu es Deus absconditus, Deus Israel Salvator. '—Isai. xlv. 15.

THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

‘ One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.’

No. IX.

AUGUST 31, 1839.

VOL. I.

But these men blaspheme whatsoever things they know not, and whatsoever things they naturally know, like dumb beasts, in these they are corrupted.—They are clouds without water which are carried about by winds ;—raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own confusion, wandering stars : to whom the storm of darkness is reserved for ever.—St. Jude, v. 10 and 13.

Though the *Christian Advocate* might not think proper to notice the second article of our first number, in which it was proved from scripture and reason that the Catholic Church is the true Church of Christ ; though he might wish to steal silent and unobserved out of the pitfall, into which, either from ignorance of the nature of the ground, or from an overweening confidence in his skill, he was unfortunately thrown on the subject of the Unity of Truth ; though he might be allowed to attack our Faith by misrepresentations, and instantly to retire as soon as the points assailed were defended, or to state facts at variance with history, and to leave them unsupported, when denied, in order soon afterwards to adduce them with bolder assurance ; though he might be supposed to adopt this method—a method, which, besides suiting his character, rescues him from many a difficulty ;—yet we certainly expected, that having advanced his single, grand and favourite dogma, viz., ‘ that the Bible is the sole rule of faith,’ he would for our sakes have graced it with some specious semblance of proof, or condescended at least to make some reply to the mass of solid arguments which we arrayed against it. For it is upon this leading maxim, that most of the assertions, which the *Advocate* has made, and most of the charges which he has alleged, against the Catholic Church, entirely depend. If his hypothesis be false, it is clear that the consequences, which he rightly deduces from it, must be also false. Now at the very outset he confidently stated that ‘ the Bible is the sole rule,’ but did not deign to assign for it the shadow of a proof. Time after time he persisted in forcing the licentious principle on our sight, but still left it unadorned even with the thinnest veil of reason. At length, pressed by the authority of the Bible itself, by the testimonies of a host of Fathers, by the clear and strong dictates of reason, he at once in his last number sets everything of the kind at defiance, and shouting aloud ‘ the Bible is the only rule,’ he stubbornly refuses to advance a single proof in support of his principle.

It may seem strange that the *Advocate*, who thus puts forward *unproved* assertions in the very face of arguments which refute them, should,

without assigning a reason, fling scornfully aside the *proved* statements of his opponent under the polite names of quibbles, fallacies, and assumptions. But his talent in argument is of the same extraordinary character as his knowledge of history. In his method of reasoning, this champion of Protestantism finds no difficulty in confounding together the fixed meanings of the most essential words, as if he were totally ignorant of their import, and consequently dares demonstrate the unscripturalness of the fundamental principles of the Catholic Church, though Protestants themselves admit them to be most scriptural, because they are their own. But it is in what he calls 'the broad outlines of History,' where a very imperfect knowledge of language may serve to make him more or less intelligible to his readers, where no deep and consecutive reasoning is demanded, where he may state amusing facts that are either dubious or false without so great a danger of being immediately brought to shame, where he can strip a fact of its true motives and circumstances, and clothe it in others which best suit his fancy, where by a word he can make what takes place in some obscure remote corner of the earth, appear as the common practice of the Catholic Church, where in fine, as soon as he is beaten and driven from one fact, he can easily slip away and take shelter behind another, maintaining a kind of desultory skirmish in religion,—it is in this 'broad' field that the *Advocate*, as he himself correctly asserts, can display his singular abilities to the best advantage. Wherefore quitting the old methods of dispute adopted by the learned and well-educated men of the Church of England, and choosing for himself an untried arena, where he hopes to reap honours that will be as brilliant as new, he threatens to grapple with Popery, the ancient foe of his race, and to lay it prostrate on the ground of Modern Facts. He in his 13th and 15th numbers had boasted that on this new field of MODERN FACTS he would demonstrate against Popery the *unchangeableness of its principles in ALL AGES*; a property which forms the pride and glory of the Catholic Church, because it is the distinguishing badge of Truth. However strange for a foe, and novel in its manner, such an attempt may seem to a person of common understanding, it is nothing to the towering genius of the *Advocate*, who, growing bolder as he advances, now scorns alike his own past efforts, as well as those of his predecessors. Let us regard him as he appears in his 16th number, the last but one. Having made the wonderful discovery that what we asserted of the tenets of his church, might be applied with some truth to the disciplinary practice of ours, viz. that they were variable and evanescent in their hues, he now advances forward clad in metaphorical armour, and threatens with proud defiance to execute more than his former pledge,—to demonstrate the *unchangeableness* of our Church's principles in ALL AGES, by the *changeableness* of her MODERN facts or of her MODERN practice which varies according to the circumstances of time and place!!!

We decline to make any comment on this singular feat in controversy, but leave it to the good sense and unbiassed judgment of the public, lest if we press our opponent too closely upon it, and prove its absurdity to a demonstration, we may be charged with quibbles, assumptions and fallacies. If it should be deemed as extraordinary as any of the famous exploits of Gulliver, we can only palliate it on the supposition that the *Advocate* was so stung yet withal so charmed with our attack on the diversified colours of his faith,—an attack which, decorated with the prettiest flowers of

speech, seemed like a wreath of thorns intertwined with roses,—that in defiance of all sense and reason he was determined to essay on us a similar attack, forgetting, or rather having yet to learn, that it is not words which wound, but the pungent truth that lurks beneath them. However, though we cannot exactly conjecture what by his singular argument he means to achieve against the Catholic Church, yet we have no doubt from his spirit that he meditates in his mind something very terrific. We may perhaps come at his meaning by reverting to his long article in his 13th number, where he states that *Popery is not the true church and unchangeable in its nature and spirit*. Dropping ‘the unchangeable spirit,’ which, turn it how he will, makes against him because it is the characteristic of truth, and does nothing but confound his meaning which of itself is sufficiently vague, we presume his object is to show, that the Catholic Church is not the true Church, because its spirit is opposed to the spirit of Christianity. If he establish this point, he will, without any allusion to ‘unchangeableness,’ completely prove the falsehood of the Catholic Church. He then undertakes to make good his charge by stating some modern facts, or some points of modern practice, which betray, as he would have us understand, the opposition of her spirit to the Christian doctrine. We hope we do full justice to the statement of the *Advocate’s* question.

Before, however, we reply to his modern facts or points of modern practice, it will be well to lay down a few obvious principles, which will serve very much to facilitate the investigation and render our answers clear to the simplest understanding. No fact then can have weight against the holiness of the spirit of the Catholic Church,

1°. If it be false either in itself, or as to its authors, causes, motives, circumstances, and end.

2°. If it be the fact of an individual, or of a community, or of a district; for though such a fact be true in every point, it cannot be laid to the charge of the Universal Church, which is guiltless of it.

3°. If it is in direct opposition to the spirit and the doctrine of the Catholic Church which, far from sanctioning, condemns it.

If these principles be applied to the *Advocate’s* modern facts which, with the same guileful purpose perhaps as Satan of old, have stolen into the Paradise of the Church, each one of them, like the toad at Eve’s ear touched by the angel’s spear, will immediately start up and assume its own proper shape.

1st. Fact. *The Pope, the head of the church, is honoured as the Deity*. As we would fain treat the *Advocate* with the utmost politeness, we have the pleasure to assure him in our philosophical language, that this is one of the blackest rays which was ever shot from the swartest planet of his constellation. The Pope like ourselves is but a worm of the earth, and doomed like ourselves to *work out his salvation with fear and trembling*. The *Advocate* perhaps would prefer to enjoy his pleasing dream of delusion; but if he wishes to have solid information on this head, we advise him to consult some little child of the Catholic Free School.

2nd. Fact. *The church claims the power to forgive sins*. Well! what then? Before the exercise of such a power can be said to be repugnant to the spirit of Christ’s Church, the *Advocate* ought to have proved that Christ bequeathed no such power to his Church; otherwise he is guilty of what the schoolmen term ‘*petitio principii*,’ or what we in plain English

call 'begging the question.' Indeed though we soon discovered that it was in the penny lying no-Popery tracts that he had gathered the riches of his historical knowledge, we are yet to learn in what school he has studied his logic. His logic, we think, like his religion, is a system of his own. As he has forgotten to support his assertion by something of argument, we shall be most happy to furnish him with a scriptural passage which will suit him admirably. *As the father hath sent me, I also send you. Receive ye the Holy Ghost : whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them, and whose sins you shall retain they are retained.* St. John c. 20. v. 23. These words, under the magical interpretation of the *Advocate*, will of course signify,—As the Father hath sent me, so I do NOT send you : whose sins you shall forgive, they are NOT forgiven them, and whose sins you shall retain, they are NOT retained. This is the doctrine of the *scriptural* church ! How *unscriptural* must the spirit of Popery be, that will not maintain the very reverse of what our Saviour declares in the scriptures !

3rd. Fact. *The mediatorship of the saints.* If the *Advocate* means to insinuate (for he speaks equivocally) that the saints are considered otherwise by Catholics than infinitely distant from Jesus Christ, by whose merits they are what they are and hold whatever influence they exert, he asserts that which is not true. If he refers to the real Catholic doctrine, he should prove it to be false, before he lays it down as repugnant to the spirit of Christianity. But we have before treated this subject at large. We need now ask but one single question. Does that person make a king of a minister who begs of the minister to prefer his petition to the king ? The *Advocate* thinks or asserts so, and thus proves Popery to be unchristian.

4th. Fact. *The Catholic Church a persecuting and destroying system. Massacre of St. Bartholomew.* If this fact be judged by the three principles which we have laid down, it will be found to have no weight against the Catholic Church. For the account of it, as given by several enemies of the Catholic Church, is 1° erroneous, as religion was not the motive nor the clergy in any way the abettors or advisers of the deed. 2°. It was a fact perpetrated by some individuals without previous concert. 3°. The deed is opposed to the very spirit and doctrine of the church. We shall give our readers the account of it in our next number. As for the Inquisition, it was a *local state-affair* of the Peninsula.

5th Fact. *The persecution of the Waldenses, Lollards, Albigenses Reformers.* These sectarians were punished for treason, or slain in battle by the civil power, against which they had rebelled. Their death cannot be ascribed to the church, who had no hand in it ; for having every where established the faith of Christ by her own blood, she knew how to preserve it without shedding the blood of others. It was not till a thousand years after Christ, that the civil power any where made heresy a state-crime. But when the one Catholic Faith had completely triumphed over error, and had established itself in every country of Europe, it was found by experience that heresy never burst out in a country without introducing the wildest disorder, and threatening to shake the Government to its foundations. Heresy was not tolerated, because it was the sure forerunner of treason. The Lollards and Albigenses, as soon as they had thrown off their allegiance plighted to God in Baptism, rose immediately in rebellion against their earthly Sovereign, and whilst they strenuously vindicated liberty of conscience with the Bible, they were prompt in asserting their civil liberty with

the sword. The Reformers of the 16th Century, animated with the same spirit, ran in the footsteps of their reforming predecessors, and confirmed the judgment which Catholic states had formed of heresy. Wherever the new creed spread its infection around, there forthwith, as on its proper soil, rebellion started up into existence, and deluged the land with kindred blood. Holland admits the new gospel-doctrine, and immediately revolts against Philip; Germany is enlightened through its circles, and presently the sons of the gospel are seen marching in great force against Charles V.; the Huguenots gather strength in France, and because they are not permitted to pillage the churches and massacre the clergy as they please, they declare war against their lawful monarch, and fight seventeen pitched battles against him in order to approve themselves true sons of the Lord. In England at this time there could be no rebellion, because the Government was Protestant and the subjects Catholic; but there is such sympathy between heresy and revolt, that Elizabeth, who in her own country could only persecute, sent money and troops to aid heretical rebellion in France and Holland. Thus the very reverse of the above scene took place in those countries where the Government was the first to become Protestant. There we find the King unsheathing the sword of persecution against the old established religion, and exerting his whole authority to put it down, whilst its professors are content to defend it by meekly yielding their property to confiscation, their names to reproach, and their heads to the axe. In no instance are they seen for religion's sake to fly to arms. If indeed they had unfurled the banner of revolt, they might with much justice have pleaded, that the sacred and long-standing rights and liberties of their country had been violated. Could rebellion ever be justifiable, it was certainly so in their case. But Catholics who look beyond this world, had higher and nobler views. Firm in their allegiance to their King, as they were steadfast in their faith to God, they, like the first Christians whose spirit glowed in their breasts, were ready in every danger to shed their blood for the tyrant who persecuted them with unrelenting cruelty. Thus we see at once the falsehood of the *Advocate's* remark, that the Catholic Church propagates her doctrines by schemes at which humanity shudders, while the Protestant Church uses the simple means of appealing to reason and the scriptures!!

6th. Fact. *Bible denied to the Laity and education refused to the lower orders in Italy and Mexico. Papal decree against infant schools. Bishop of Quito.* These statements, which, presented as they are, labour under the difficulty of being false, not only prove nothing for the *Advocate's* assertion, but show, in a very strong point of view, the character of the man, who from truth slides into equivocation and from equivocation into falsehood within the space of a few pages. If he cites a Cardinal's letter, which speaks of a prohibition against infant schools conducted by Protestant ministers, or if he adduces a passage which shows that the Protestant Bible and Protestant schools are discountenanced by the clergy of Mexico, he heads the one article with 'Papal decree against Infant-Schools, and the other by 'Schools and the Bible anathematized in South America.' This is deceitful enough, especially for the many who read only the heading of his articles. But soon his language grows bolder. For in his long editorial article of the 13th number where he reverts to the same facts, he declares *that in Mexico and Italy education is denounced and denied by a bull to the lower orders. The*

plain fact is this, that the Protestant Bible is forbidden to the people, not the Catholic one ; and as for education, there is not a nation in the world where the lower orders are better or more universally educated than in Italy. If it be thought that the *Advocate* has failed in proving his assertion of the unchristian spirit of Popery, it must be admitted, that he has established a character of *veracity* which will assist him wonderfully in reclaiming the benighted Catholics of India.

The Prussian Government has recently afforded another striking proof of its spirit of intolerance and persecution towards its Catholic subjects in the arrest and imprisonment of the Archbishop of Posen. His only crime, like that of the Venerable Archbishop of Cologne, was a conscientious refusal to violate the laws of the Church on the question of mixed marriages. In a letter dated Berlin, May 1st, he writes to a friend that in consequence of an order from His Majesty he repaired from Posen to Berlin, when he was directed to confer with M. Duesberg, relative to the question of mixed marriages. The conference, he says, lasted three days ; but the result not answering the hopes and desires of the Government, the King, offended at what he called the obstinacy and fanaticism of the Prelate, ordered the Minister of Justice to make known to him a Decree which had been passed against him. The Decree was accordingly read to him. By it he was condemned to a revocation of his archiepiscopal functions, as if these functions were of a merely temporal nature ; to six months incarceration in a fortress ; disqualified to fill any office in Prussia ; condemned to pay all judicial expences ; interdicted from the administration of his diocese ; all correspondence with his clergy prohibited, as also his leaving Berlin without the permission of the Minister of Public Worship. The Decree, however, exculpated him from the charge of having endeavoured to excite disturbance in the province or of having acted disrespectfully towards the King. The Archbishop could not of course recognize the competency of a civil tribunal in a purely religious question, and therefore considered the Decree null, but lamented it as a proof of his being in disgrace with the King. Thus the matter then stood : ' I am then ' observes the Bishop, ' a prisoner in Berlin, and await the execution of the Decree, which I consider a violence done to my person ; so that you see a criminal prisoner in the person of your brother. Do not trouble yourself however on the subject : prison is no ignominy in this case, nor will it stain my name or family. The conviction of my conscience which made me sustain, with perseverance, my opinion in this affair of the Holy Church, will give me courage to support my sufferings. I shall be happy to endure to the end, ' &c.

So much then for the mild spirit of toleration which regulates the conduct of the Protestant Government of Prussia towards its Catholic subjects ; a Government, which be it remembered, pledged itself in the most solemn manner when the Rhenish Provinces were ceded to it, to protect the Catholic religion in its full integrity, and to grant perfect liberty of conscience to its Catholic subjects. Were a Catholic Government to act with such flagrant treachery towards its Protestant subjects, what eloquent declamation should we not have against Popish persecution ? But in a Protestant Government towards Papists, it is no more than a proper regard for the interests of religion !

LUTHER—THE FATHER OF PROTESTANTISM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—Your brother of the *Advocate* in his last issue declares that he *cares not for fathers and councils*, and yet with that admirable consistency, which he has invariably manifested since he commenced the work of *deca-tholization*, he quotes a passage from Luther (betraying the grossest egotism) because, the Editor says, ‘it is so much to our mind and conveys our sentiments entirely.’—Hence it is evident, that notwithstanding his great aversion to ‘fathers and councils,’ he not only consults the Fathers of the Reformation occasionally, but is glad to parade their writings when *they convey his* (the Editor’s) *sentiments*.

As the *Advocate* seems pleased at having the great Luther on his side, allow me to give, for his further gratification, the character of that incomparable Patriarch of the Reformation, drawn by himself and some of his disciples.

Luther himself bears testimony that, ‘while a Catholic, he passed his life in austerities, in watching, in fasts and praying, in poverty, chastity, and obedience.’* When once reformed, that is to say, another man, he says that—‘he can no longer forego the indulgence of the vilest natural propensities.’†

1. ‘I burn with a thousand flames in my unsubdued flesh; * * *
2. ‘I, who ought to be fervent in spirit, am only fervent in impurity.’‡
3. ‘To the best of my judgment, there is neither emperor, nor king, nor devil, to whom I would yield; no, I would not yield even to the whole world.’§
4. ‘He was so well aware of his immorality, as we are informed by his favourite disciple, that he wished they would remove him from the office of preaching.’||
5. His timid companion acknowledges that he had received blows from him *ab ipso colaphos accepi*.¶
6. ‘I tremble, (wrote he to the same friend,) when I think of the passions of Luther; they yield not in violence to the passions of Hercules. * *
7. ‘This man, (said one of his cotemporary reformers,) is absolutely mad. He never ceases to combat truth against all justice, even against the cry of his own conscience.’††

8. ‘He is puffed up with pride and arrogance, and seduced by Satan.’‡‡
 9. ‘Yes; the devil has made himself master of Luther, to such a degree, as to make one believe he wishes to gain entire possession of him.’§§

‘I wonder more, O Luther, (wrote Henry VIII. to him,) that thou art not, in good earnest, ashamed, and that thou darest to lift up thine eyes either before God or man, seeing that thou hast been so light and so inconstant as to allow thyself to be transported by the instigation of the devil to thy foolish concupiscences. Thou, a brother of the order of St. Augustine, hast been the first to abuse a consecrated nun; which sin would have been, in times past, so rigorously punished. But so far art thou from correcting thy fault, that moreover, shameful to say, thou hast taken her publicly to wife, having contracted with her an incestuous marriage, and abused the poor and miserable, . . . to the great scandal of the world, the reproach and opprobrium of thy country, the contempt of holy matrimony, and the great dishonour and injury of the vows made to God. Finally, what is still more detestable, instead of being cast down and overwhelmed with grief and confusion, as thou oughtest to be, at thy incestuous marriage, O miserable wretch, thou makest a boast of it, and

* Tom. v. In cap. I. ad Galat. v. 14. † Ibid. *Serm. de Matrim.* fol. 119. ‡ Luth. *Entret. de Table.* § Idem. *Resp. ad Maled. Reg. Aug.* || Sleid Book II. An. 1520. ¶ Mel. Letters to Theodore. ** Mel. Letters to Theodore. †† Hospinian. ‡‡ Ecclampadius. §§ Zuinglius.

instead of asking forgiveness for thy unfortunate crime, thou dost incite all debauched religious, by thy letters and thy writings, to do the same.*

'God, to punish that pride of Luther, which is discoverable in all his works, (says one of the first sacramentarians,) withdrew his spirit from him, abandoning him to the spirit of error and of lying, which will always possess those who have followed his opinions, until they leave them.'†

'Luther treats us as an execrable and condemned sect, but let him take care lest he condemn himself as an arch-heretic, from the sole fact, that he will not and cannot associate himself with those who confess Christ. But how strangely does this fellow let himself be carried away by his devils! How disgusting is his language, and how full are his words of the devils of hell! He says that the devil dwells now and for ever in the bodies of the Zuinglians; that blasphemies exhale from their insatanized, supersatanized, and persatanized breasts; that their tongues are nothing but lying tongues, moved at the will of Satan, infused, perfused, and transfused with his infernal poison! Did ever any one hear such language come out of an enraged demon?‡

'He wrote all his works by the impulse and the dictation of the devil, with whom he had dealing, and who in the struggle seemed to have thrown him by victorious arguments.'§

'It is not an uncommon thing, (said Zuinglius,) to find Luther contradicting himself from one page to another. . . . ;|| and to see him in the midst of his followers, you would believe him to be possessed by a phalanx of devils.'¶

Erasmus, the most learned man of his age, he who has been called the pride of Holland, the love and delight of Great Britain, and of almost every other nation ** wrote to Luther himself: 'All good people lament and groan over the fatal schism with which thou shakest the world by the arrogant, unbridled, and seditious spirit.' ††

'Luther, (says Erasmus again,) begins to be no longer pleasing to his disciples, so much that they treat him as a heretic, and affirm that being void of the spirit of the Gospel, he is delivered over to the deliriums of a worldly spirit.' ‡‡

'In very truth Luther is extremely corrupt, (said Calvin;) §§ would to God he had taken pains to put more restraint upon that intemperance which rages in every part of him! would to God he had been attentive to discover his vices.' ||||

Calvin says again, that 'Luther had done nothing to any purpose, that people ought not to let themselves be duped by following his steps and being half papist; that it is much better to build a church entirely afresh ¶¶ Sometimes, it is true, Calvin praised Luther so far as to call him 'the restorer of Christianity.'* He protested however against their honouring him with the name of Elias. His disciples afterwards made the same protestations. 'Those (said they) who put Luther in the rank of the prophets, and constitute his writings the rule of the church, have deserved exceedingly ill of the church of Christ, and expose themselves and their churches to the ridicule and cutting reproaches of their adversaries.' †

'Thy school (replied Calvin to Wesphal the Lutheran,) is nothing but a stinking pig-stye. . . . ; dost thou hear me, thou dog? dost thou hear me, thou madman? dost thou hear me, thou huge beast?'

Carlostadius, while retired at Orlamund, had so far ingratiated himself with the inhabitants, that they must needs stone Luther, who had run over to rate him for his false opinions respecting the Eucharist. Luther tells us this in his letter to the inhabitants of Strasburgh: 'These Christians attacked me with a shower of stones. This was their blessing: may a thousand devils take thee! mayst thou break thy neck before thou returnest home again.'§

* In Horim. p. 229. † Conrad Reis. ‡ *Upon the Lord's Supper*, B. 2. § *The church of Zurich against the Confession of Luther*, p. 61. ¶ *Ibid.* ¶¶ T. II. *Respons. ad Confess. Lutheri*, fol. 454. ** *Ibid.* fol. 381. †† Preface to the London Edition, year 1642. ‡‡ Epistle to Luther, 1626. §§ Epistle to Cardinal Sadolet, 1628. || Cited by Coaray Schlussemberg. ||| *Theol. Cal. L. II.* fol. 126. * See Florim. † *Ibid.* p. 887. ‡ *In Admon. de Lib. Concord*, ch. VI. § *Tom. II.* fol. 447. Sen. Germ.

Thus much will suffice for the present ! In my next I hope to give a further view of Luther's character, which I am persuaded will prove highly interesting to the members of the Temperance Societies in India.

26th August, 1839.

AU REVOIR.

THE REAL PRESENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—All the Christians of all nations of the world, except Protestants, have in all ages believed and still believe in the Real Presence and Transubstantiation. Even the catechism of the established Church of England declares that 'the Body and Blood of Christ, are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.' Since Christ affirms 'This is my Body,' who is so daring as to doubt of it ? and since he affirms 'This is my Blood,' who will deny that it is his blood ? At Cana of Gallilee; Christ, by an act of his will, turned 'water into wine, and is he not to be credited when he changes wine into blood ? The father of the pretended reformation, Martin Luther, himself condemned the Protestants who denied the Corporeal Presence, for he found the text of the Gospel too plain to declare it metaphorical, although he was endeavouring to subvert *Popery*. Are the undermentioned passages of the Gospel of St. John (Chapter 6 v. 51 a 59,) metaphorical ?

'I am the living bread, which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give, is my flesh for the life of the world. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying: How can this man give us his flesh to eat ? Then Jesus said to them: Amen, Amen, I say unto you: except you eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life: and I will raise him up in the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed: and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, abideth in me and I in him. As the living Father sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me. This is the bread that came down from heaven. Not as your Father did eat Manna, and are dead. He that eateth this bread shall live for ever.'

Is not then our doctrine of Real Presence and Transubstantiation in exact conformity with the abovementioned words of Christ ?

Christ indeed used metaphors, but then he explains that they are metaphors; but in the institution of the Sacrament, he had assured them, his flesh should be meat indeed, and his blood drink indeed. Not a word falls from him to signify that his legacy is not to be understood in the plain sense of the terms he makes use of. Did not the Jews understand it literally and express great surprise at the annunciation of the mystery and ask, 'How can this man give us his flesh ?'

27th August, 1839.

JACQUES.

THE ADVOCATE CHALLENGED.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—The *Advocate* asserts in his last number that he is ready to 'meet papists,' when 'they touch one argument or adduce scripture.' Why Sir,

I think you have very fairly done both in having incontestibly proved that scripture alone is not a sufficient rule of Faith. If I am not mistaken, you have repeatedly challenged your contemporary to refute the arguments you had advanced in opposition to his declared belief, that the scripture alone, privately interpreted, is the Protestant's guide to salvation. Let him prove the truth of his assertion if he can by the 'law and the testimony' of which he so vain gloriously boasts.

27th August, 1839.

A LAYMAN.

PROTESTANTISM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—It appears that the conductor of the 'different religious denomination' journal, yclept the *Christian Advocate*, will not come to an issue with you, for he is merely quibbling and asserting,—and again re-quibbling and re-asserting his fallacies without the least attempt to anything like fair argument.

It is apparent that the Editor of the *Advocate*, though repeatedly challenged, is ashamed to avow to which religious sect he belongs.—It is true he has declared himself a Protestant, but what is Protestantism? The great and philosophical Burke says, 'Protestantism, as things stand, is no description of religion at all, or of any principle, religious, moral or political, but is a mere negation'—What then are we to understand by the term, when a Protestant of such pre-eminent talents can give no definite idea of Protestantism? Nor is he singular in this opinion, for the Revd. W. Newman, Fellow of Oriel College in a letter to Dr. Fausset printed Oxford 1838, declares, that 'Protestantism is but a negative word, such as almost forces on its professors the idea of a vague indefinite creed, makes them turn their thoughts to how much they may doubt, deny, ridicule, or resist rather than what they believe.' In short this Protestant Divine is not contented with a bare negation of Protestantism, but is for ever banishing the very term from the vocabulary of his Church. Thus much for the *Advocate's* Protestantism!

As to his religious belief, which the Editor alleges is founded on the Bible and the Bible alone, I think you have in a masterly manner clearly demonstrated the fallacy of his vague assertion in your Articles 'Scripture alone not a sufficient rule of faith.'

27th August, 1839.

NO BIGOT.

OBITUARY.

From private letters we learn the demise of the two following personages :

In Bagdad, at the close of last year, His Grace the Catholic Patriarch of Chaldea, who terminated the career of his evangelical labours at the advanced age of 105.—His Holiness the Pope has appointed as his successor the Most Reverend Nicholas Isaiah, late Archbishop of Aderbegian.

On the 13th of December last, the Right Revrend Joseph A. Fazio, Bishop of Fipasa, Vicar Apostolic of Aleppo, and Delegate Apostolic of Mount Libanus, Egypt, Abyssinia, Arabia, and Cyprus. His Lordship was in his 36th year, and was previously intended to succeed the Right Reverend Bishop Pezzoni, Vicar Apostolic of Agra, but was prevented by ill health from completing his journey to India, which he had made so far as Juddah.

Selections.

THE ALLIANCE BETWEEN POPERY AND HEATHENISM.

Letter, III.—Dr. Wiseman to Mr. Poynder.

SIR,—I proceed now briefly to touch the particular grounds of your charge against us, and see how far you are borne out in attributing the practices of the present Catholic Church to the rites of heathenism. There are several ways of refuting your supposed parallels; as by proving what you call the corruptions of popery to have existed in the Christian Church, before you, who make the distinction between the two, allow popery to have existed; by showing them to have had a different origin altogether; or by proving you to be entirely mistaken in your facts. I shall use these methods indiscriminately; and will consult brevity above all other things.

1. Your first attack (P. 17) is upon the use of *incense* in the church. It was used among the heathens; granted. Therefore the Catholics derived it from them; certainly not. The Jews used it before the Romans in the worship of the true God; did the adoption of it by the heathens render it evil? Did not Christianity descend in right line from the Jewish religion; is it not therefore more honest to attribute rites common both to us and them, rather to those whom we profess to follow than to the others? But fairness is I suppose more than Catholics have a right to except from you; we must drive you from the very field before you will be just to us. Do I say then that we have taken it from the Jews? No, certainly; we derive it from a higher example, and from a holier temple than theirs. For did not the temple of heaven, which surely we may think it right to copy, show to John, angels offering up incense at the altar as symbolical of holy prayer? (Revel. viii.) And thus alone do we offer it; for if you will look at the prayers used in presenting it at the altar, you will find them simply referring to this symbolic meaning. It is not with us a sacrificial rite as among the heathens; for the priest, and the ministers, and the people, are all honoured by its use.

Was it just in you to say nothing of the use of incense in the ancient church? For doubtless one so learned as you are in ecclesiastical antiquities, is aware, that Dr. Beveridge, bishop of St. Asaph's, defends the genuineness of the Apostolic canons, from Daillie's objection that in the third of them it is expressly said: 'Let it not be lawful to offer any thing at the altar, except *oil for the lamps, and incense at the time of the holy oblation.*' The learned bishop contends that this clause no way effects the apostolic origin of these canons, because incense was certainly offered up in the ancient church. And for this he quotes a passage from St. Hippolytus, bishop of Porto in the third century, as well as the testimony of St. Ambrose.* To which he might have added the decree of Pope Sergius in the second, preserved in the pontifical book of Damascus, that 'no nun should touch the sacred pall, or serve incense in the church;' also the testimony of St. Ephren, the earliest Syriac writer, who thus speaks in his last will: 'Do not bury me with incense and spices, for to me it is a useless glory. Burn your *incense in the sanctuary*, but perform my funeral with prayer. Offer your *odours to God*, but follow me with psalms.'† How did the Syriac Church get this custom from the Roman heathens? Perhaps they derived it from the Chinese, as you have taken pains to prove that these also practise it.

Is it fair to deduce that offering incense was anciently considered essentially heathenish, from the Christians having refused to offer it expressly to *idols*, in token of apostacy? or because Theodosius confiscates a place where it has been offered to *idols*? For the most determined opposers of the ancient use of incense allow it to have been adopted in his time in the church.

* Codex canonum Ecclesiae primitivae vindicatus. Lond. 1678. p. 190. See the canon itself, p. 434.

† Assemani Bibliotheca Orient. tom. i. p. 143.

2. Your second topic presents a similar mixture of suppression of truth and extenuation of falsehood. Holy-water is, you say, manifestly of heathen origin, simply again because the heathens used lustration, as the Jews also did. Because the ancient Christians would not eat meat sprinkled with the apostate Julian's *holy water*, as you call it, they equally abhorred every other sort. 'Hence we may see,' such is your conclusion, 'what opposite opinions the primitive church and the Romish church entertained on holy water.' (p. 9) Now, see the absurdity, I had almost written dishonesty, of this reasoning. You first of all christian with the name which we give to our blessed water, the lustral water of the heathens, and then conclude that because they abhorred this, they detested the other. Suppose I argued thus: the ancient Christians would not go into a *church* (meaning thereby a heathen temple) how horrible then, and how much at variance with the practice of antiquity, is the Protestant custom of praying in churches. And in this manner you conclude most self-contentedly, that holy water 'could not have been introduced so early' as Pope Alexander I., or 113 years after Christ, because St. Justin calls the *heathen* lustrations, a device of the devil! (p. 19)

But did not the ancient Christians use holy water? Indeed they did, and that in a manner to shame us. They did not sprinkle themselves with it, to be sure, or 'help themselves from a vessel at the door,' as you express it; they did more than either, they *bathed in it*. Read *Paciaudi De sacris Christianorum Balneis*, Rome, 1758, and you will find much to instruct you on this subject. You will there see how the ancient Christians used to bathe themselves before going to church, after the commission of any sin:—'Why do you run to the bath after sin?' asks St. John Chrysostom; 'Is it not because you consider yourself dirtier than any filth?'* And Theophylactus writes in a similar strain. An ancient Christian bath was discovered by Ciampini among the ruins of Rome. But what is more to our purpose, the ancient Christians never went to receive the Eucharist, or even to pray in their churches, without washing their hands. 'What propriety is there,' says Tertullian, 'to go to prayer with washed hands, and yet with an unclean spirit.'† St. Chrysostom is still stronger:—'Thou dardest not touch the sacred victim with unwashed hands, although pressed by extreme necessity: approach not, therefore, with an unwashed soul.'‡

To supply the necessary convenience for this rite, a fountain or basin was provided at the church porch, at which the faithful washed, as St. Paulinus of Nola has several times described in the churches which he built. I will quote only one passage.

'Sancta nitens famulis interfluit atria lymphis

Cantharus, intranturque manus lavat amne ministro.' §

St. Leo the Great built one at the gate of St. Paul's church, which was celebrated by Ennodius of Pavia in eight verses, of which I will quote the four first lines.

'Unda lavat carnis maculas, sed crimina purgat

Purificatque animas, mundior amne fides.

Quisquis suis meritis veneranda sacraria Pauli

Ingrederis, supplex ablue fonte manus.*

The same was the practice of the Greek church; for Eusebius tells us with

* Homil. 18 in 1 Cor. † De oratione, cap. xi.

‡ Homil. ad pop. Antioch.

§ 'The portal's basin yields a sparkling wave,
Where they who enter in, their hands may lave.'

Epist. 32 ad Sulpic. Sever.

* 'Waters can wash the flesh's stains, but faith
Purer than they, can cleanse the soul's defects;

Thou, whose enterest this holy place,
Through the apostle's merits venerable,

Wash, humbly praying, at this font thy hands.—

Ennodii Opera, Carm. 199, tom. i.—Perhaps the comma should be placed after *supplex*.

commendation, how Paulinus, bishop of Tyre, placed in the porch of a splendid church which he built, 'the symbols of sacred purification, that is, fountains, which gave, by their abundant supply, means of washing themselves to those who entered the temple.'[†] In fact we have several of the old lustral vases, with early christian symbols and inscriptions, belonging to both the Churches, as a celebrated Latin one at Pesaro, and a Greek one at Venice, drawings of both which you will find in Pacciaudi's work, with an ample description.

Thus, Sir, you see how much more plentifully the ancient christians 'helped themselves from a vessel at the door of a church' than we do; for they washed their hands in their holy water. But you will say, this was not *holy* water, for we do not read of any blessing pronounced over it.—Does then a blessing, or the prayer of faith over any of God's creatures, spoil it or render it unfit for use? Or does the use of it become superstitious thereby? The early Christians used to wash their hands at the door of their churches in token of purity; this has been modified into dipping the finger into vessels of blessed water, placed in the same situation, and with the same symbolical intent; the rite may be modified, but it is essentially the same.

But, in fact, water was blessed in the ancient Church, and that two ways: more solemnly on the eve of the Epiphany, and less so once every month;—and this is called in the Greek Euchologium, the *μικρὸς ἀγιασμὸς*, the *lesser benediction*. The waters of both, although the first was primarily intended for baptism, were carried home by the faithful and highly valued; so that St. John Chrysostom, whom I dare say you do not consider a papist, tells us, that they were miraculously preserved from corruption for many years; which he adduces as a proof of their value, and the holiness of this practice.* Nay, the learned Cave quotes the authority of this father in favour of the miracle, and makes no objection to it.[†] All which looks very much like popish doctrine on this subject.

But how do you think an ancient father would have answered your reasoning, that this practice is taken from the heathens? Listen to St. Augustine.—'Accursed be the Manichee in Faustus, who says we have changed nothing in the customs of the heathens, knowing not what he speaks about. For they who otherwise believe, hope and love, must necessarily, also, otherwise, live. And if the use of some things appear in us similar to that of the heathens, as of food, of drink, of *ablutions*, . . . he uses these things very differently, who directs them to a different end.'[‡] This, Sir, is strong language, but well deserved by those who write without well knowing what they are treating of.

But I must not leave this subject, without noticing the ceremony of blessing horses, which I know not why you couple with the use of holy water. (p. 20.) In your account there many are inaccuracies, which I beg to point out. *First*, the priest does not sprinkle the animals singly, but often in droves, and placed at such a distance, that the holy water cannot reach them; consequently, the contact of holy water is not necessary for the blessing. *Secondly*, there is no payment of *tant part tête*, as you express it; a small voluntary oblation is given by some, but there is no tax, and the greater part of those who choose to bring their horses there, give nothing. *Thirdly*, it is *quite clear* that the sprinkling of horses at the games was no sacred rite, but only for their refreshment, as my learned colleague's (Professor Nibby) dissertation on the circus of Romulus, would have taught you.

What therefore is the ceremony? Why, a prayer pronounced by a priest, that those who use those animals may not receive injury or hurt; and the holy-water is sprinkled, as it is at the conclusion of every blessing in the church, as a token of the direction or application of the prayer, and as an emblem of purification. I have known several Protestants go into the sacristy and pro-

[†] Histor. Eccles. lib. x.

* Homil. 23 de Bapt. Christi. tom. i. p. 278.

[†] Hist. Script. Eccles. Dissert. 2, De Libris Eccles. Gr. voce *agiasmos*.

[‡] Adv. Faustum, lib. xx. c. 23.

cure a copy of the prayer, and express themselves quite satisfied of its perfect propriety.

But, Sir, have you nothing similar to this ceremony ? You are, I doubt not strictly observant of religious forms ; and certainly every day *bless your meat*. What greater superstition or heathenish folly is there in blessing a living animal than a dead one,—a horse, which through its wickedness may hurt you, or a pheasant or partridge, which can only do you harm by your own intemperance ? Do you not see, that the blessing of an irrational thing is only another form of a blessing on those who use it ; that as you perceive nothing monstrous in the idea of blessing or praying over meat, or animals deprived of life, there can be no harm in anticipating that blessing, and giving them the benefit of it while alive ?

(To be continued.)

LUTHER.

In the history of the Reformation, Luther is incomparably the greatest name. We see him, in the skilful composition of Robertson, the chief figure of a group of gowmsmen, standing in contrast on the canvas with the crowned rivals of France and Austria and their attendant warriors, but blended in the unity of that historic picture. This amazing influence on the revolution of his own age and on the opinions of mankind, seems to have produced, as is not unnatural, an exaggerated notion of his intellectual greatness. It is admitted on all sides that he wrote his own language with force and purity ; and he is reckoned one of its best models. The hymn in use with the Lutheran Church, many of which are his own, possess a simple dignity and devoutness, never, probably, excelled in that class of poetry, and alike distinguished from the poverty of Sternhold or Brady, and from the meretricious ornaments of later writers. But from the Latin works of Luther, few readers, I believe, will rise without disappointment. Their intemperance, their coarseness, their inelegance, their scurrility, their wild paradoxes, that menace the foundations of religious morality, are not compensated, so far at least as my slight acquaintance with them extends, by much strength or acuteness, and still less by any impressive eloquence. Some of his treatises—and we may instance his reply to Henry the Eighth, or the book *Against the Falsely named Order of Bishops*, can be described as little else than bellowing in bad Latin. Neither of these books display, as far as I can judge, any striking ability. It is not to be imagined that a man of his vivid parts fails to perceive an advantage in that close grappling, sentence by sentence, with an adversary, which fills most of his controversial writings ; and in scornful irony he had no superior. His epistle to Erasmus, prefixed to the treatise *De Servo Arbitrio* is bitterly insolent in terms as civil as he could use. But the clear and comprehensive line of argument, which enlightens the reader's understanding and resolves his difficulties, is always wanting. An unbounded dogmatism, resting on an absolute confidence in the infallibility, practically speaking, of his own judgment, pervades his writings ; no indulgence is shown, no pause allowed, to the hesitating ; whatever stands in the way of his decisions, the fathers of the church, the schoolmen and philosophers, the canons and councils, are swept away in a current of impetuous declamation ; and as every thing contained in Scripture, according to Luther, is easy to be understood, and can only be understood in his sense, every deviation from his doctrine incurs the anathema of perdition. Jerome, he says, far from being rightly canonised, must, but for some special grace, have been damned for his interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. That the Zuinglians, as well as the whole Church of Rome and the Anabaptists, were shut out by their tenets from salvation, is more than insinuated in numerous passages of Luther's writings. Yet he had passed himself through several changes of opinion. In 1518, he rejected auricular confession ; in 1520, it was both useful and necessary ; not long afterwards, it was again laid aside. I have found it impossible to reconcile, or to understand

his tenets concerning faith and works; and can only perceive, that, if there be any reservation in favour of the latter, not merely sophistical, of which I am hardly well convinced, it consists in distinctions too subtle for the people to apprehend. These are not the oscillations of the balance in a calm understanding, conscious of the difficulty which so often attends the estimate of opposite presumptions, but alternate gusts of dogmatism, during which, for the time, he was as tenacious of his judgment as if it had been uniform.—*Hallam's Introduction to the History of Literature.*

THE 'UNKNOWN TONGUE.'

(From the Catholic Magazine.)

We know not who the wiseacre was that first classed the language of ancient Rome among the unknown tongues; but of this we are aware, that to *him*, at least, it must have been as unintelligible as the gibberish occasionally spouted, in certain conventicles, for the edification of fools. The sapient discovery, that Latin, long the prevailing language of the civilized world, and, till lately, the *written* language of literary and scientific men, is an unknown tongue, though heartily laughed at by every person of common sense, was too good a subject to be dropt; and, accordingly, it has been long used as a peg on which to hang a theme of vituperation against the Catholic church, for continuing the use of that language in her solemn services. Many persons, whose education should have placed them above such a vulgar prejudice, winked at the ignorant absurdity; and, to the disgrace of our literature, men, educated at our National Universities, were to be found gravely urging a charge as unfounded as ridiculous.—This part of the discipline of our church requires not our feeble aid in its vindication. It would be an easy matter to show the great superiority of a uniform service, in a fixed and unalterable language, over a variety of translations, in the modern tongues and dialects; but this is a subject on which we do not mean to enter, our object being to draw the attention of our readers to this fact, that those very persons, who decry our practice, do not stickle occasionally to follow the good old system, by offering up their prayers in the language of the church. Take, for instance, the following *modern* instances:—

'Yesterday morning (16 November) about half-past eleven, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the bishops of London and Salisbury, attended by Sir H. Jenner and a numerous body of civilians, in their scarlet robes, were met at the grand west-door of the entrance, by the dignitaries of the cathedral, and proceeded in grand procession (the powerful organ of the cathedral playing a solemn fugue) through the body to the choir; when the litany, in Latin, was read by the junior bishop on the bench, Dr. Denison, bishop of Salisbury. The grand anthem, 'The Lord God Omnipotent reigneth' was then performed by the minor canons and lay vicars; after which a 'clerum' was delivered in the purest Latinity by the venerable Dr. Lyall, archdeacon of Colchester. It had the merit of being entirely divested of politics, and the tenor was to impress upon his auditors the expediency of every Protestant state having a body of regularly educated clergy under organized heads connected with it; and, that its doctrines and discipline should be expounded and emanate from them. He then expatiated on the character and exemplary conduct and efficiency of the parochial clergy. The *Gloria Patri* concluded the imposing service; when the Archbishop, attended by the proctors sent to represent the clergy from each diocese, proceeded to elect, as their prolocutor, the very Rev. Dr. Goodenough (late master of Westminster-school) dean of Wells.'—*Morning Chronicle.*

At the late installation of the Duke of Montrose, as Lord Chancellor of the University of Glasgow, the Very Rev. Principal Macfarlane, according to the newspapers delivered a prayer in Latin, read the Minutes of Senatus Academicus, and delivered a short address in Latin. His Grace the Duke of

Montrose, who appeared in excellent spirits, and delighted with the proceedings, also addressed the assemblage in Latin, which was cheered at the conclusion of almost every sentence.

BIGOTRY IN GENEVA.

An instance is given in a late German paper.—By the extension of the town of Geneva into a canton, it came to comprise a number of Catholics, amounting to two-fifths of the population. The cause, as well as the natural progress of tolerant ideas, induced the government to forbid the church service and other commemorations of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Eve. Some zealous Protestants, like Dr. Elrington, thought religion in danger, and the Deity offended, if the atrocities committed in past times were not all duly and annually remembered. They forced open the church doors, and six preachers read the forbidden service for the zealous congregation, one is happy to say small, which attended it. The Council of State, in consequence suspended the six ecclesiastics, and threaten further prosecution. The Consistory has interposed to protect the preachers, though censuring, at the same time, their illegal zeal. Meantime, the Catholics, perceiving that the government is acting with impartiality and justice, have refrained from encreasing the embarrassment and trouble by any demonstration.

ANOTHER CONVERSION.

Extract of a letter, dated St. Edmund's College, Doway. November 21, 1837.
 'My soul is overflowing with inexpressible delight; for whilst Divine Providence has been displaying its goodness towards you, by scattering amongst you its temporal favours, he has had regard to our humility, and has conferred on us an inestimable spiritual blessing. In the month of August last an intimate friend of mine residing at Antwerp, introduced to the members of St. Edmund's Mr. Thomas Amos, eldest son of Mr. Thomas S. Amos, late solicitor general of the colony of New South Wales. About the middle of September last, Mr. Amos became an inmate of St. Edmund's, though a Protestant, with a mind impregnated with every possible prejudice against our holy Church. He has, however, this day become a member of the holy Catholic Church. I am so much delighted with this happy occurrence, that I cannot describe to you my feelings. Mr. Amos is a gentleman of splendid talents and of very extensive information, a distinguished architect, having studied under Pugin the father, and being an intimate friend of young Pugin whose conversion to the Catholic faith has been so much spoken of. Mr. Amos is determined to embrace the Ecclesiastical state, if his health will permit; for I regret to say he is in an extreme delicate state.

INTELLIGENCE.

SWITZERLAND.—A chapel is about being erected at Schaffhausen, in which, of late years, there has been an increase of Catholics. The government of the Canton has granted a site, but it requires, as a condition, that a sum of 20,000 florins, (about £1720 sterling) for the support of the priest, the expenses of the sacristy, and other annual contingencies should be sunk. A subscription has been entered into at Paris under the auspices of the Count Montalembert; and the Duke of Orleans has opened it by a donation of 300 francs.

Printed by Messrs. W. Rushton and Co., Calcutta, for the Proprietors price one rupee per month, or ten rupees per annum in advance. To non subscribers 8 annas per number.

THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

'One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.'

NO. X.

SEPTEMBER 7 1839.

VOL. I.

The editor of the *Christian Advocate* has declared in a vein of mighty independence and self-confidence that he cares not for Fathers or Councils. 'We appeal' says he, 'to the word of God;' and he has, somewhat inconsistently, as it appears to us, backed his opinion by the authority of Father Luther. It is true, the illustrious father of the reformation declared that '*Relying on the strong foundation of his learning, he yielded not in pride, either to emperor, king, or devil; no, not the universe, itself.*' (Rep. ad Maled. Reg. Aug.) but it cannot be denied, that, in one instance at least, *this great man* yielded to authority, and that was, when, as stated by himself, he abolished the mass by the authority of the devil, (Luther Tom. T. Witt. 1558 Fol. 443). It would further appear, that even Luther's opinion on private judgment underwent some change, for in writing against Zuinglius and Æcolampadius, he observes as follows. '*If the world is to last much longer, I do declare, considering all these different interpretations of the Scripture, there is no other means remaining for us to preserve the Unity of the Faith, than that of receiving the decrees of the councils, and taking refuge under her authority.*' From this, it is evident that he began to perceive the dreadful consequences of the licentious liberty he had conferred on his followers. The *Advocate* appeals to the word of God, to the law, and the testimony. How easy it is to make such an appeal. It has been made by every fanatic and impostor. Johanna Southcote, like the *Advocate*, appealed to the word of God, when she declared that the Lord of Glory was to be born of her.

Such an appeal, however, sounds very fine, and doubtless goes a great way with those who do not take the trouble of examining and judging for themselves. But may we be permitted to ask the *Advocate*, by what means he arrives at the certain knowledge of *what is the word of God?* The learned Dr. Walton observes, in the Prolegomena to his Polyglot, that 'the word of God does not consist in mere letters whether written or printed, but in the *true sense of it*; which no one can better interpret than the true Church, to which Christ committed this sacred pledge.' Now, what certitude, we would ask, has the *Advocate* that the sense he draws from the scripture is the true one, especially, as it is opposed, by that of millions in every respect as competent judges as himself? What assurance has he of

his own infallibility,—that he is not himself one of the ‘*Sinners and Errorists*,’ that he alone is right, and that all others are wrong? The Scriptures, it is true, are divine; but his interpretation of them is human; and it is by his own interpretation that he is guided. So that, when he says, he appeals to the word of God, he in fact appeals to *his own opinion*; which, according to his system, is, with him, the great, sovereign, independent, universal, and infallible judge, both of the Bible itself and of all religious controversies that ever were or ever will be raised. We are by no means surprised at the *Advocate’s* rejection of the authority of the fathers; he had indeed no alternative between doing so or relinquishing the privilege of picking any religion for himself that jumped with his humour or inclination, out of the Scripture. This is a liberty which the fathers never enjoyed:—it was conferred by the Magna Charta of the Reformation, and consequently came too late for them.

We certainly expected that the *Advocate* would have made some attempt to prove the truth of the very basis of the Protestant system; viz., that Scripture alone interpreted by private judgment is a sufficient rule of Faith! We thought that in support of this principle,—upon which the whole question between the Catholic and Protestant hinges,—he would have endeavoured to have made out a case from the following texts of Scripture, which are those usually adduced on the subject by our separated brethren. Such, for example, as when Christ (John v. 35) told the unbelieving Jews to search the Scripture in order to be convinced, that the Prophecies of the Old Testament had been fulfilled in him. The commendation given to the Berians (Acts xvii. 11,) for their diligence in searching the ancient prophecies to verify that the Messiah was to be born in such a time and in such a place; and that his life and his death were to be marked by certain specific circumstances, which had been exactly realized in Christ. The following passages from St. John have often been quoted on the subject.’ ‘These things are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name.’ But the *Advocate* no doubt perceived, that if this proved anything, it proved too much for his case. Also where St. Paul praises Timothy for his knowledge of the Scriptures, ‘which are able,’ says the apostle, ‘to make the wise to salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, &c.’ The *Advocate* was, perhaps, sensible, that this passage could not prove any thing in favour of the Protestant maxim, without at the same time proving that the Old Testament alone was sufficient, the New not having been written at the time mentioned: and he is doubtless aware that the question between us is not about the profitability of Scriptures but their *all sufficiency*—not about the duty of searching them for particular objects, but the *imperative duty of seeking all things in them*, not about their being a rule of faith when interpreted by the living authority, which God has established; but that they are a *sufficient and exclusive rule when interpreted by private judgment*. He might have alluded to our Saviour’s condemnation. (Mark vii,) of some human traditions which, we are informed by St. Jerome, had been recently introduced among the Jews by Sammai, Killal, Achuba, and other Pharisees, or he might have dwelt upon some of the many other, but equally inconclusive passages, which have been so often and so ineffectually adduced by Protestants, in support of their favourite doctrine. But instead of so

much as even attempting to refute our objections to the admission of Scripture, privately interpreted, as a sufficient and independent authority in all matters of faith, he goes on asserting, we cannot say arguing, as if no such objection had ever been made. In other words, he assumes for granted the very point in dispute and then grounds his arguments, assertions we should say, upon it as if it had actually been admitted!!!

We would have thought that the very first care of one, whose sole object was the charitable desire of reclaiming others from the meshes of antiquated error, would have been to establish, by clear and solid demonstration, the basis of his own position. Whereas the *Advocate*, instead of even attempting to do this, gives us nothing but assertion for fact, invective for argument, and abuse for proof.

While we admit the *Advocate's* consistency in setting at naught all authority except his own, we feel at a loss to conceive upon what principle, or with what consistency he excluded Deists and Unitarians from the number of good men, (by which we understand him to mean that they are without the saving influence of Christianity.) They have like himself deduced their doctrines from Scripture interpreted by their own reason; and in doing so they have only followed out the principle which gave birth to the reformation. By what right or authority then does the *Christian Advocate* presume to exclude them from the number of good men? Is it because they have availed themselves to a greater extent than himself of 'The glorious Charter of Christian Liberty', by which each individual is privileged to interpret the Scriptures, and form his creed out of them, according to the dictates of his own reason? Surely, the *Advocate* would not be so inconsistent as to say to them, 'You are bound to examine the Scriptures and judge for yourself as to their meaning, but you are not at liberty to find such-and-such doctrine in them.' The Deist and Unitarian hold the same rule of faith as the *Advocate*; therefore in condemning them he violates his own principle, inasmuch as it is to it alone, that they appeal always as the proof, and sanction of their respective systems and so does the Atheist:—

'Like you,' says he to the Protestant, 'I admit no guide, but my own reason. Like you, I obey its dictates; and believe, what I understand. The Calvinist does not understand the real presence; therefore, he does not admit it. The Socinian does not understand the Trinity: consequently, he rejects it. The Deist understands no mystery: and hence, he believes none. Now, in my eyes, the Divinity is the greatest, and most impervious, of all mysteries: therefore, my reason, unable to comprehend it, cannot, with consistency, admit it. I merely claim to myself the same privilege which you do. We have, each of us, the same rule of belief; excluding, each of us, the rule of authority. Hence, with what justice, can you condemn me? If, indeed, I ought to renounce my reason,—or if you judge me guilty for listening to its suggestions,—then do you, too, renounce yours, which is not more infallible than mine. Abjure your rule of faith; and declare honestly, that what you have taught hitherto, according to this rule, is devoid of all foundation; and that, if the truth do exist any where, you have not yet found out by what means it should be discovered.'

It follows from the above reasoning, that the Protestants cannot refuse to tolerate the Atheist, without abandoning their own leading principle. If they say that the latter makes bad use of his reason; or that he is not sincere,—might not the same, with equal justice, be said of every class of Heretics? The reproach is, certainly, inconsistent in the mouths of those sectarists: because it applies equally to them all. What the Protestant says of the Atheist, the

Atheist says equally of the Protestant. And pray, who is the judge between them? Reason? But, it is precisely the judgment of reason, that is contested. To call in reason to decide the difference, is solving the question by the question itself. It is laughing at common sense.'

The *Christian Advocate* finds no Authority in the word of God for Transubstantiation, he therefore rejects, it as false and absurd. The Unitarian finds no authority in Scripture for the doctrine of the Trinity, he therefore rejects it, as false and absurd. The Deist finds no authority in Scripture for the Divinity of Christ or for any mystery whatsoever, he therefore rejects it and all mysteries as false and absurd. Should the *Advocate* say to the Unitarian, the mystery of the Trinity which you reject is in my opinion clearly 'contained in the Scripture.' The probable answer would be—'it may be so; but in mine it is absurd and contradictory, and quite unsupported by Scripture. So then your reason says, yes—but mine says, no. Now reason for reason and conviction for conviction, why is not my reason and my conviction as good as yours? But at all events if it be the fact,—as you allow it is,—that the judgment of each individual is the appointed guide, and arbiter of his belief,—if this be so, why then allow me to follow mine as you very properly think it right to follow yours?' We would ask the *Advocate* what answer he could give to this. And we defy him to adduce a single argument against the mystery of the Real Presence which would not, if coming from a Deist, make with equal force against the mystery of the Incarnation or the Trinity.

The prediction of Catholics that the principle which authorizes every one to form his religious belief by the light of his own reason, out of the Scripture, would lead to infidelity, has already become too strikingly realized. 'For in all those countries where once the reformation was most triumphant, we find that infidelity and a spirit of indifference to religion is every where prevalent. 'The dissensions that prevail,' says a learned Protestant, 'among the multiplied sects that are come forth from the schools of Luther and Calvin, have been unfortunately but too favourable to the birth and progress of incredulity,' (DR. KETTS Consd. on the Prophecies.) And Lord Bacon says, that 'when sects in religion are numerous they are the cause of Atheism.'

The state of Protestant Germany is thus described by the Rev. Mr. Rose, in a sermon preached by him before the University of Cambridge.

From the state of protestantism in Germany, a stronger, and perhaps more important, lesson is offered on that subject, which is said to form the *bases* and the *boast* of Protestantism,—the right of private judgement. The terrible evils resulting to the German Church from its exercise are the strongest practical proof of the wisdom, and necessity of restraining it. Among the German Divines, it is a favourite doctrine, that it is impossible that there could have been a miracle; and the words of Scripture are examined, and forced into any meaning but their own. By some the miracles are said to be that mythology which must attend every religion to gain the attention of the multitude, by some the common and well-known ribaldry of the infidel is unsparingly used; by one or more high in station in the Church, some artifice, and probably magnetism, has been, even within the last ten years, suggested, others go so far as to attack the whole body of prophets as impostors, in most outrageous and revolting terms. This doctrine is taught by divines from the pulpit,—by professors from the chairs of theology: it is addressed to the old to free them from ancient prejudices; and to the young, as the knowledge which can make them truly wise. This abdication of Christianity is not confined either to the Lutheran or Calvinistic profession, but extends its bane-

ful and withering influence, with baneful force over each. It is curious to observe in what way they get rid of all miracles.' 'The majority,' observes Mr. Robert Haldane, (Second Review of the British and Foreign Bible Society,) 'of pastors and professors of divinity in Germany, for the last thirty years, have called themselves Rationalists.—Rationalism consists in a sort of *idolatry of the human understanding*, and it therefore rejects all truth which cannot be discovered except by divine revelation. On the whole, the *greatest number* of the pastors and professors in the north-west and middle part of Germany, are Rational Naturalists; in other words decided *Deists*.' Speaking of Prussia in particular his 'accounts' say, that with a very few exceptions, the Protestant clergy, 'go almost where you will are in a state of Neologian darkness,' or in other words, that 'they are Rationalists' or 'decided Deists.' As to Hungary, the people there 'who still bear the name of *Protestant Christians*, are, according to said 'accounts,' *very little better than the heathens* either in refined scepticism or gross superstition. The value of a minister, is rated according to his *oratorical powers*, no matter what doctrine he teaches, or what tenets he holds.' And as to France, they say, that '*the great body of Protestant ministers*,' are unfit for their office, being, Arians, Socinians, Neologists, of no fixed opinion whatever as respects the gospel; they are in general blind leaders of the blind. The state of Protestantism we are told, is precisely the same in Holland, Norway, Denmark, and Sweden.

In Switzerland, the case is similar, Geneva that *Protestant Rome*, as it loved to call itself,—is now according to Grenus, Heyer, Empaytez, &c. no longer Christian. It has become, they have demonstrated, completely Socinian. Inasmuch that its pastors, they assure us, not only laugh at the creed of Calvin, not only pity the credulity, which could ever have believed such nonsense,—but even systematically reject the most fundamental articles of Christianity. 'Indeed,' says Empaytez, 'such is now their incredulity, in relation to the Divinity of Christ, that it would be more easy to find in their sermons the names of Socrates, and Plato, than the name of this Sacred Being.'

So much for free inquiry. Good God! what liberties will men not take with thy word, when they have released themselves from the wise and salutary restraints of thy Church! Well indeed might Mr. Haldane, as a sincere and well-meaning man, exclaim, 'what must they (the Catholics) conclude concerning Protestants, and the cause of the reformation, when they see that the name 'Protestant pastor' is sufficient to sanction every heresy, while the doctrines of the gospel are entirely disregarded? No wonder they openly declare that the state of religion among Protestants forms the strongest argument against the reformation! *In their Church there are fundamental doctrines retained of the highest importance, which if really embraced, will conduct to life eternal.* With all the enormous evils with which it is chargeable, there is a remnant in that Church of the people of God, Rev. 8. 4. *But the state of the public ministry, in many Protestant Churches is such that salvation by means of it is impossible.*

Yet Mr. Haldane is a Member of the Edinburgh Reformation Society! Such are the dismal consequences of the liberty conferred on each individual by the glorious Magna Charta of the so-called Reformation—the liberty of taking his own interpretation of the Scripture as the sole rule of his belief. But it is no more than what was predicted, from the nature of the Protestant system, not only by Catholics, but also by the French Encyclopedists. 'Il faut,' they say 'que les Protestants deviennent Sociniens;' 'not indeed,' they add, 'for the honor of their religion, but for the credit of their philosophy.' It then appears, that there is no solid resting-ground between the Rock of Catholicity and the mire of Infidelity: those who abandon the former will gradually slide into the latter.

We do not ask the *Christian Advocate* to admit the authority of the fathers and councils; but we call upon him, and, if he be confident in the

truth of his cause, he will not *evade* the call, to prove the Canon and inspiration of the scriptures, and that they were intended by our Blessed Saviour to be, as interpreted by private judgment, the sole rule of Christian faith. To quote Scripture against us until he has clearly established these points would be a shere begging of the whole question. He appeals to the word of God but we would wish to know by what means, since he rejects the authority of the fathers and councils, he can prove that the Holy Scriptures contain the entire word of God.

A letter addressed to the Congregation of Picpus at Paris, announces that, there is not now a single Idolator left in the Isles of Gambier. Mgr. Rouchouse, Bishop of Nilopolis, who appears to have received particular graces from Heaven to convert these savage tribes, has succeeded, not only in establishing among them the observation of moral and religious precepts, but also in infusing into their hearts a taste for evangelical counsels. Thus twenty young females have agreed to live in community, and to learn to practice the rules of perfection, till other directors and models could be sent from Europe. Before the receipt of this letter, some ladies of the above mentioned Congregation of Picpus, had embarked for those countries.

We give below the dates of the origin of the doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church in opposition to the dates quoted from the *United Service Gazette* by the *Christian Advocate*. But to proceed clearly we will distinguish the doctrines and practices which are tenets or articles of faith, from the disciplinary observances which the Catholic Church has power to establish for the spiritual welfare of her children according to times and circumstances, and which constitute no point of faith being mere matters of discipline.

Antiquity of Popery according to the *United Service Gazette*.

Roman Catholics often talk of the antiquity of their religion, but we think the following dates of the origin of their peculiar doctrines and practices will show them to be too modern for a Scriptural Christian to receive.

Holy Water, . . . 120, M.D.

Penance, 150, A.F.
M.D

Monkery 328, M.D.

Latin Mass, 394, M.D.

A.F.

Extreme Unc-
tion, 558, A.F.

Antiquity of Popery which can be proved by the Roman Catholics for the use and instruction of the *United Service Gazette*, of the *Christian Advocate*, and of all Evangelical Christians.

Roman Catholics often talk of the antiquity of their Religion, and we think the following dates of their peculiar doctrines and practices will shew them to be *not too modern* for a Scriptural Christian. Such as are marked A. F. are Articles of Faith and those marked M.D. are Matters of Discipline.

From the time of the apostles.

Sacrament—vide Confession.

Public Penance. St. Paul, 1. Cor. chap. 5 v. 1 to 5.

Matt. Chap. 4 v. 1, &c. Chap. 11 v. 7 &c. Cha. 19 v. 29.

Mass—in Latin Language from the time of the apostles, in Italy and in all the western countries.

A.F. Mass—Vide Transubstantiation.

St. James, Chap. 5 v. 14. 15.

- Purgatory, 593, A.F. Matt. chap. 12 v. 36—1 Cor. chap. 3 v. 13. 14. 15.
- Worship of the }
Saints and of } 594, A.F. Gen. chap. 28 v. 16—Exod. chap. 32 v. 11.
the Blessed }
Virgin Mary } 48. chap. 16. v. 9—Matt. chap. 19 v. 23—Apoc.
chap. 2 v. 26. chap. 3 v. 21. chap. 6 v. 9.
- Papal Usurpation, 607, A.F. Is yet to begin.
Papal supremacy—Matt. 16. v. 18. 19—Luke 22.
v. 31. 32.—John 21. v. 16. 17. Matt. 10. v. 2—Acts
9. v. 32. chap. 15. v. 7.
- M.D. Temporal sovereignty, solemnly granted by
Pepin to the Roman Church 765.
- Kissing the
Pope's toe... 709. It is a mark of respect which is usually paid
to the Holy Father, but which forms no part of
either faith or discipline.
- Image worship, 715, A.F. { Exod. 25. v. 18—Ibid 37 v. 7—Par. lib. 2 ch.
3 v. 10. 11—1 Par. ch. 28 v. 18. 19—Heb. 11
v. 21—Phil. chap. 2 v. 10—Psal. 98 v. 5.
- Canonization, .. 930, M.D. In the first age of the Church, the Martyrs
were canonized by the voice of the Christian
people, afterwards the Bishops and St. Cyprian
prescribed some rules to prevent abuse. Subse-
quently in order to obviate the possibility of
abuse in such matters, the Popes reserved to
themselves the canonization of Saints, about the
end of the eleventh century.
- Baptism of Bells, 1000, M.D. Blessing of Bells—This use is anterior to the
year 770.
- Transubstantia-
tion, 1000, A.F. Matt. 26 v. 26—Mark 14 v. 22. 24—Luke 22
v. 19. John 6 v. 51. 52, &c. 1 Cor. 10 v. 16—ch.
11 v. 24. 25. 27. 29.
- Celibacy, 1015, M.D. Matt. 19 v. 11. 12—1. Cor. 7. v. 6, 7, 8, 27,
32, 33, 35, 37, 38.
- Indulgences, .. 1190, A.F. Matt. 14 v. 18. 19.—2. Cor. 2 v. 6. 7. 8, 10.
- Dispensations, .. 1200, M.D. From the time of the Apostles.
- Confession, 1215, A.F. Matt. 3 v. 6 Acts 19 v. 18—St. Jam. 5 v. 16—
Matt. 18 v. 18—John 20 v. 22, 23.
- Elevation, 1222, M.D. Rite or ceremony established in the twelfth
century when Berenger denied the Real Presence.
- A.F. Adoration, began with the Real Presence,
vide Transubstantiation.
- Inquisition, 1204, It belongs neither to faith nor discipline, nor
has it any necessary connexion with the Catho-
lic Religion.

Four Apostolical Missionaries from the Seminary of Foreign Missions of Paris have arrived here on the French Ship *Asié*. Two of these Reverend gentlemen, Messrs. Aimé Dupond, of the diocese of Arras, and Jean Beurel, of the diocese of Saint Brieux, are destined for the Mission of Siam, and the two other Missionaries Messrs. Jean Baptist Ferreol, of the diocese of Avignon, and Louis Taillandier, of the diocese of Mans, for that of China. The *Asié* has also brought out, from the same Seminary, three Missionaries, Messrs. Joachim Richon, of the diocese of Tarantaise, Louis Matthian, of the diocese of Grenoble, and Jacques Roger, of

the diocese of Bayeux, all of whom have joined the Mission at Pondichery.

'How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, of them that bring glad tidings of good things! But all do not obey the Gospel. For Isaias saith: Lord, who hath believed our report? Faith then cometh by hearing: and hearing by the word of Christ. But I say: Have they not heard? Yes, verily, their sound hath gone forth into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the whole world.' (*Romans, Chap. x. v. 15. to 18.*)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—As you have declaimed against the *Christian Advocate* for its want of candour in not admitting letters from all parties, I have concluded, you of course will not betray a similar partiality; and that therefore, the enquiries of one, who is a searcher after truth, will not be disappointed, either in your admitting these lines into your columns, or in replying to the 10 following questions *distinctly and categorically*—'yea,' or 'nay.'

1st. Is each particular work of God a perfect one in its kind or not?

2nd. Are all the evidences of the *Christian Religion* sufficient or not sufficient to convince an Infidel?

3rd. Are the prophecies of revelation fulfilled, or in course of fulfillment; at least the leading ones; e. g. the dispersion of the Jews, the spread of Christianity,—the mystic power of anti-christ,—the predictions connected with Mahomedanism and the Man of Sin. II. Eph. 2d Thess. Chapter 5th to 12th verse: who or what is the last, please explain.

4th. How many, and what heresies and sects were there within the three first and purest centuries of the Church?

5th. Is it correct, that the holy scriptures state, that the first and oldest (ergo the mother church) was that of Jerusalem, and pre-existent to that planted at Rome; that the first Christian council was held at Jerusalem, and that the Bishop of Rome

We have neither laid it down as a rule to admit letters from all parties, nor declaimed against the *Christian Advocate* for not acting up to the rule which *he* seems to have established. Hence for the future we shall consistently exercise our liberty in rejecting such communications as that of an INFIDEL.

1st. Each particular work of God is perfect in its kind with respect to God's design, but not in itself.

2nd. All the evidences of the *Christian Religion* are sufficient to convince an infidel, but to convert him much more is required.

3d. Some prophecies are fulfilled and some in course of fulfilment. The two first are fulfilled to a great extent; those regarding Antichrist, if indeed Antichrist be come, are in course of fulfilment: with respect to the cited passages, though we pretend not to point out the person, or event alluded to therein, we can prove, that the fanatical interpretation of them, adopted by some Protestants, but rejected by the more learned and sensible, is false and repugnant to the text.

4th. The Church is as pure now in her doctrine as during the three first centuries, because she remains always the same. But the heretics, who went out from her by teaching opinions contrary to the sound doctrine delivered to her pastors, were during that period in number 51. The leading ones were the Ebionites, Cerinthians, Nicolaitas, Marcionites, Valentinians, Basilidians, Saturninians, Gnostics, Montanists, Tationists, Rebaptizers, Millenari-

was not its president, and if not, why?

6th. Are the two following great or greatest works of God according to the Christian system, viz. redemption and revelation, complete, perfect, and divine?

7th. Have Popes ever contradicted Popes, or councils contravened councils? surely not!

8th. Why the Apochryphal books are admitted into the scriptures, when as I am informed, both the Jews and primitive Christians, and the Fathers, particularly St. Jerome are unitedly against their being inspired books?

9th. Did the founder of Christianity establish any of the Papal orders, especially that of the Jesuits, and give it a peculiar code of morals, and if not, why he did not?

10th. Are all departed Popes in Heaven?—and was Leo X. an Infidel, and if so, whether I may not be eventually saved, though I continue

ans, Paul of Samosta, the followers of Norationism, Sabellianism, Manicheism, &c.

5th. It is correct that the holy scriptures state that the Church of Jesus Christ took its rise at Jerusalem; that the first Christian council was held in that city; that at this council St. Peter presided, if not as Bishop of Rome, at least as head-pastor and chief Bishop of the universal church.

6th. The two following great or greatest works of God according to the Christian system (religion) viz. Redemption and Revelation, are complete, perfect, and divine on God's part, but not on the part of those men who do not act up to God's will and design.

7th. Popes speaking 'ex-cathedrâ' have never contradicted Popes speaking 'ex cathedrâ,' and approved councils have never contravened and *can never contravene* approved councils.

8th. No apochryphal books are admitted into the scriptures by the Catholic Church, but certain books which were inspired, are rejected by the Protestant Church. He is misinformed as to the adduced authority against them.

9th. The founder of Christianity did not personally establish any of the Papal (Religious) orders, but he taught and strongly encouraged the high and grand maxims of perfection on which they are all based, and drew out the sketch of the moral code by which the superstructure of each is raised.

10th. Leo X. was no Infidel. Our correspondent will know whether all departed Popes are in heaven as soon as he enters it; which however will not be the case, if he continues what his signature imports.

Yours obediently,

AN 'INFIDEL,'

'HERETIC,' or what you will.

MARTIN LUTHER—THE VOTARY OF BACCHUS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—That the Temperance Societies have been productive of considerable good is now very generally admitted, although when they were first established in England the attempt was greatly ridiculed; but, I believe, no one has yet endeavoured to trace the progress of modern inebriety, albeit, many well written treatises on the pernicious effects of drunkenness

have been published to the world. I however incline to think, that sufficient proofs can be adduced, that drunkenness began with the Reformation, at least that, at that time the vice became rooted amongst Christians, for I have read that drunkenness had more to do in bringing about that *glorious event* than is generally supposed ; for it was in the Public Houses of Wittemberg that Luther and his pot-companions formed their plan of operations.

Reader, will you charge me with impertinence if I place MARTIN LUTHER, the Father of the Reformation,—the *favourite* of the *Christian Advocate*, at the head of the votaries of Bacchus! No, you cannot, when I prove to you from *his own* writings that he thought that drunkenness was a very good antidote against the temptations of the devil, to withstand which he not only drank to excess himself but recommended the same course to his friends.—Judge for yourself, good reader, from the following extract of a letter* written by Luther to his friend Dr. Weller :—

‘Be courageous and banish altogether those most unpleasant thoughts : and as often as the devil shall assail you with such reflections, have recourse at once to social conversation, or DRINK FREELY, jest, trifle, or do something else to make yourself merry. It is necessary sometimes to DRINK FREELY, to trifle and make merry, and thus *commit* some *sin* out of hatred and contempt for the devil, so as to leave him no chance of troubling our consciences about trifles ; otherwise we are conquered, if we are too anxious and solicitous not to sin at all. If then the devil should ever say to you—‘don’t drink,’ do you answer him—I WILL DRINK, for this very reason, that you forbade me, and I WILL DRINK THE MORE on that account. Thus we must always do the contrary of what Satan opposes. For what other reason can you think that *I drink at such a rate the purest and the best*, that I am so free spoken, and indulge so often in the excess of the table, unless to mock and vex the devil, who had prepared to vex and mock me. Would to Heaven that I could at this moment, designate some glaring sin wherewith to mock the devil, and let him know that I acknowledge no sin and am conscious of none. We, I repeat it, whom the devil thus assails and harasses, must altogether lose sight of and forget the WHOLE DECALOGUE. But if ever the devil should reproach us with our sins and prove us so guilty as to deserve death and hell ; but what next ? why then you will be damned for ever. No such thing, for I know one who suffered for me and satisfied for me, and he is called Jesus Christ, the son of God : where he shall dwell, there shall I dwell also. Written in the year 1546.’

If Protestants are indebted to Luther for bringing about the Reformation, they must be equally indebted to him for encouraging the sin of drunkenness both by precept and example. Members of the Temperance Societies look ye to this !

2d September, 1839.

AU REVOIR.

P. S. As a further elucidation of the character of the great Reformer of the Catholic Church, I beg you will insert the accompanying article,† showing the intimacy of Luther with Satan, at whose suggestion he abolished the Mass, as recorded by Luther himself.

* Epist. 12, Lutheri ad D. Hier Wellerum. Ed. Lipsiæ, 1702.

† Vide Selections.

THE ADVOCATE REDIVIVUS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—The secret is out! Thanks to the *Commercial Advertiser* for disclosing the long and sedulously hidden sect of the editor of the misnamed *Christian Advocate*, who after all is a *dissenting* Protestant, and what is still more amusing, belongs to a denomination of Dissenters called INDEPENDENTS!

‘Independents!—Oh!—Kind heaven,
How apt the name—how justly given,
Of *virtue* and her *works* attendant
Of truth and reason ‘independent,’
Of all the sects *whose faith’s a riddle*
Who wane and wander like the moon,
Who turn the Bible into a fiddle,
And set its texts to ev’ry tune,
None can such variations play,
None *more intolerant* than they!’

Now Sir, if the term Protestant be a negation according to Burke and Newman, what definite idea can we form of the word Dissenter. Probably those who profess the invented faith will explain this if they can.

As the declared object of the *Christian Advocate* is to reclaim Catholics, it cannot be amiss if I were to enquire from the editor himself, by whom was the *Independent* Protestant Religion founded? Was it not by Mr. John Robinson of Norfolk, once a Master of the Congregation of Brownists, who derived their cognomen from a ranting man of the name of Brown, a violent preacher against the Church of England, and that Robinson, perceiving defects in the discipline of his leader found it necessary to establish, with the aid of a Mr. Henry Jacobs, a refugee, the first Independent Church in England in the seventeenth century?

In the mean while I may be permitted to say that the mode of warfare adopted by the *Christian Advocate* and the intolerant spirit displayed in its columns have met with a just rebuke from the pen of the Editor of the *Commercial Advertiser*, and I trust you will afford your readers an opportunity of seeing his sensible remarks, dictated as they must have been by a truly Christian charity towards his Catholic brethren, although opposed to them in faith and doctrine. At all events I hope the *Christian Advocate* will profit by the precepts of the *Commercial Advertiser* and henceforth learn to practise the first and greatest duty of a *Christian*—‘love thy neighbour as thyself.’

3d September, 1839.

NO BIGOT.

THE ADVOCATE CHALLENGED.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—As the *Christian Advocate* asserts in his number of the 24th August, that he is ready to meet the papists in the field of the Holy Scriptures only, and that he acknowledges not the fathers and councils of the Catholic Church, I challenge him to prove from the Scriptures alone the obligation of keeping the Sunday; if he cannot prove this, he lies under an obligation of observing the Saturday or Sabbath, with the Jews, and must confess his defeat.

Calcutta, September 2, 1839.

DOMINICALIS.

Selections.

CONSISTENCY AND CHARITY.

The *Calcutta Christian Advocate* of last Saturday contains the following remarks regarding the proceedings of the Roman Catholics :—

‘The indications of the development of the true spirit of popery in England are many; it is beginning to appear in its real garb. A monk of the order of La Trappe has been begging in Scotland for the erection of a chapel in connexion with his order in England.—Dr. McHale, a celebrated popish priest, has petitioned parliament as the *Archbishop of Tuam*!!! The parliament most properly rejected the petition. It may not be generally known that the papacy continues to nominate Bishops, &c. to all the sees in Protestant countries; but this is a new putting forth of the arrogance of the system. The popish Bishop of a see essays to address the parliament of Britain in an official capacity derived from Rome.—A young lady has publicly taken the veil in England.—That chapels in Ireland are now called churches and are adorned with spires, and the popish priests are called the priests of the parish. Some of these things may appear insignificant in themselves, but they are part of a system for trying the temper of the English people, and verily they must be blind if they cannot see through the whole plot to regain an ascendancy over the people. We wish our readers to bear in mind that but a few years have elapsed since the papists on their knees entreated the door of civil power to be opened :—it was,—they have entered in, and now would occupy the chief seats in the senate-house and the church. Convents and nunneries were illegal; now they rear their heads on every land. Monks beg in the very land of Knox for the support of their order, and the highest titles in the church are assumed and used in petitions to the senate of a Protestant people. Mr. O’Connell charged a fellow member with falsehood, because he said that Dr. McHale had falsely *assumed* the title of Archbishop. He was obliged to apologize, but what is that to this champion of popery. He had felt the public pulse, and his object was obtained. It is neither the addition of a nun to the Sisters of Charity, or the monies collected by a Trappist, or the assuming of an ecclesiastical title that is sought; it is the paving the way to power, the wearing out of those feelings which a Protestant people had justly entertained towards popery. This is the end sought, and happy will it be for the English people if they see it ere it is too late; and for the Protestants of India if they can nip it in the bud.’

After reading this paragraph, who is there that will not say that the title of the paper is a misnomer, and that it should be altered to the *Calcutta Protestant Advocate*? A struggle of fifty years has gained for the Catholics that which all liberal minded men have rejoiced in. But here is a writer who rejoices in the state of degradation and proscription in which the Catholics were placed, and who would heartily pray for their being again placed in the same situation!

The ‘Papists’ are charged with desiring ‘to regain an ascendancy over the people.’ What sect or religion is there which does not desire an increase of followers? Churchmen desire to have an ascendancy over the people. The Dissenters (to which body the *Advocate* belongs) desire the very same thing. On what principle then can we consider it a crime in Catholics to wish for followers and converts?

The establishment of converts and nunneries is offensive to the *Advocate*. But have not the Catholics the same right to erect convents and nunneries that Dissenters have to erect Chapels and meeting-houses? How would the *Advocate* relish a proposal on the part of Churchmen to repeal the Toleration Act, and to place the Dissenters on the footing in which they were since the Restoration? Would he not exclaim against the intolerance and bigotry of the church; and can he not grant the same indulgence to the Catholics? Where is his consistency? If he have not yet learnt the meaning of toleration, let him learn it from a Catholic:

That mercy I to others show,
That mercy show to me!

Or if he object to instruction from that source, let him recollect the words of inspiration, the sum of the law: ‘Do unto others as you would they should do unto you.’—*Commercial Advertiser*, August 29.

OXFORD DIVINES AND THE VIRGIN MARY.

Some of our readers are rather sceptical as to one of the Oxford Divines, Mr. Keble, having gone the length of composing a hymn to the Virgin. We confess that we have not taken the trouble to read the Oxford Tracts which develop the new theology of that university. We referred to an account given of them in a popular work, in which they are quoted in illustration of the doctrines. We are told that Mr. Newman denies that the reformation was a renunciation of the Roman Catholic faith, and maintains that it only constituted a modification of that faith. Again we learn, that another of these Theologians says, that the precedence of the Pope's over other Bishops, in England and elsewhere, is a matter suspended and under abeyance, but that precedence is not to be denied. 'He (the Pope) has certain legitimate claims which may be settled when he removes certain existing impediments to our acknowledging him.' We find also that 'in one of the Tracts, it is proposed to appropriate certain portions of the Protestant breviary to Protestant uses in the conducting of public worship,' and that one of the collects so pointed out, as adapted for use in Protestant places of worship runs thus:—

'Grant, O Lord God, that we, thy servants, may ever prosper in perpetual health of body and mind, and by the *glorious intercession* of the Blessed Mary, ever Virgin, may be delivered from present sadness, and enjoy eternal bliss;'

and then follows the hymn to the Virgin, which, in accordance with this collect, has been composed by Mr. Keble:—

Ave Maria ! Mother blest,
To whom, caressing and caressed,
Clings the eternal child ;
Favour'd beyond archangel's dream,
When first on thee, with tenderest gleam,
Thy new-born Saviour smiled.

Ave Maria ! Thou whose name
All but adoring love may claim,
Yet may we reach thy shrine ;
For he, thy Son and Saviour, vows
To crown all lowly lofty brows
With love and joy like thine.

We have no objection to the poetry ; but had not this production proceeded from the strong-hold of orthodoxy, we certainly might have questioned that of this very pretty hymn to the Virgin. The same Divines also propose to invoke St. Peter and St. Paul, and as they have got so far, the Pope may reasonably expect they will ere long recognize the whole Romish Calendar. Indeed we think his holiness might already venture to send a legate to reconcile Oxford University to the ancient Church ; and whenever he does, we trust Lord Roden will not fail to be present at the affecting ceremony.—*Bengal Hurkaru, September 4.*

LUTHER.

The confessed intimacy of Luther with Satan, at whose suggestion he abolished the Mass, as recorded by himself, 'that all Men might take care of following HIM who professes himself to follow the Devil.'*

Our first proof shall be from his letter to the Saxon Elector, where he complains of the infernal monarch's jiggling through and through his head in such a merry mood, that at times he could neither written or read!

'Diabolus,†' says he, 'interdum per meum cerebrum ita comeat, ut, nec scribere possim nec legere.'

* Chillingworth in his 8th Reason for abandoning the Protestant Religion.

† Lutherus Epis. ad Elec. Saxonie, Vol. 5. Edition of Jena, p. 485.

Whilst at other times, in a more sober one, they paced the room in deep and learned conversation. 'Mecum* in dormitorio nonnumquam deambulat. He walks sometimes about my bed-room with me,' says he, 'and often sits down to dinner, at† which I have eaten above a bushel of salt with him!' with some bottles of good Ale, I warrant you, after it, which old Martin loved in his heart!

'Nay,' says he, 'I have a pair of marvellous devils, learned and solid divines in the universities below, who constantly attend me. Habea † unum et alterum mirabilem diabolum a quibus diligenter, & attente observor. Sunt enim non vulgares, sed magni demones, imo inter diabolos magni doctores in Theologia.' A third used even to sleep with him.

'The devil,' says he, 'sleeps oftener and closer to me than my lovely Kate!'

'Diabolus‡ multo frequentius et proprius mihi accubare solet, quam mea Catherina!' We find him even wishing to fall by the hand of his sooty majesty! '¶ I should like death,' says he, 'by Satan, as I would then fall by a far more noble arm than that of the emperor!'

'Malo, et magis cupio,' says he, 'per diabolum, quam per Cæsarem mori, sic enim per magnanimum atque potentem Dominum interirem!'

Whether this most singular wish was gratified is not quite certain. Cochlius and other writers, assure us that he was, after eating a hearty supper, found dead in the morning; as however, the authenticity of the story admits of some doubt, we shall suspend our opinion. Adhuc sub iudice lis est.

Now to the famous conference, the truth of which, should the reader feel disposed to dispute, let him remember that I do no more than with the learned and eloquent Doctor Lingard, 'transcribe ¶ the very word of the magnanimous parent of the reformation!'

'I must,' says he, 'now tell a little anecdote concerning *myself* for which I trust, you will, my reverend father, forgive me, though it may somewhat disgrace you. AWAKING from a sound sleep a few nights ago, the devil (who, I can assure you, has made me pass many an uneasy one) began to speak to me as follows:

'Listen to me most learned man! Do not you know, that for these fifteen last years, you have been in the daily habit of saying private masses? Now, what if all this, while you have but committed daily acts of idolatry! and instead of the body and blood of Christ, have adored, and exhibited to others to adore nothing but plain bread and wine! To this,' says he, 'I instantly answered, I am an anointed priest, ordained by a bishop, I acted according to the commands of my superiors; why then should I not be said to have truly consecrated, as I pronounced the words diligently and said mass most devoutly! Very true, said *Satan*, but the very Turks and Heathens perform their rites in their temples *through obedience* as well as *you*; but, what if your ordination and your consecration were both false, like that of the Turks and the Samaritans!

'Hic certè sudor mihi crupit et Cor tremere atque palpitare mihi cæpit. Here,' says old Martin, 'the cold sweat began to ooze from every pore, and my heart to beat. The devil put forth his whole argumentative strength. Habetque, Gravem, et Fortem Vocem. And he certainly has a most *deep and powerful tone of voice*.' N. B. These last words of Luther so descriptive of the voice of Satan, (and which prove a true and real communication between him and the Arch-reformer on the occasion) are shamefully omitted by the Wittemberg Editors of his words in their latter editions. 'Diabolus habet gravem et Fortem Vocem,' says Luther: say his Wittemberg editors, 'let those words be expunged from the writings of Luther.' Can Doctor Ryan justly complain of a Popish index expurgatorius after this? 'nor can such an alteration long continue; on the contrary, question and answer last but an instant: and I then plainly conceived how it does sometimes happen, that people are found in the morning dead in their beds. He can destroy the human frame

* Luther. Tom. 2. Ed. Jena, Folio 77. † Concione Dom Reminiscere, Fol. 19.

‡ Colloq. Mensal Germ. Edition, Fol. 283. § lb dem, p. 275. 281.

¶ Idem Coll. Men. Fol. 32. ¶ In Hospinian Pars. Altera His. Secra. folio 131.

when and wherever he chuses. Nay, so oppress the soul as to force it from the body. Quo me sæpenumero quam proximè eduxit. As he has nearly done *mine* often: so that, I am now convinced, that both Empsor and Cœolampadius were killed in the same manner, for no human being unassisted by God, can withstand it.'

'On this occasion however, he got the upper hand of me. But still I listened to what he had to say against my priesthood and ordination.' And I request the readers attention to the following Satanic arguments, as compared with those of an opposite communion.

'First, then,' says Beelzebub, 'you must know, that, hitherto you have had neither faith, nor true knowledge of Christ: You were no better than a Turk.'

'The Turks, I myself, and all my sooty brethern, do credit the history of Christ. James, chapter 3.'

'That is, we believe his birth, his death, and ascension: But instead of loving him as a Saviour, we dread him as a rigorous judge. Such let me tell thee is my faith when, Christo relicto, deserting the *Saviour*, you have recourse to *Mary*, and the *Saints*, making them mediators between you and him!'

Reader, observe, how disagreeable to *Satan* prayer to Saints is!

'Which neither you, nor any *Papist* can deny.'

'Secondly, being ordained priest, you have consecrated, contrary to the ordinance and the intention of Christ! *He* ordered an administration to the communicants, so that all might partake a true sacrificer being a minister of the church ordinary to preach the word, according to St. Paul in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, chapter xi.' How slipantly the devil can quote scripture! 'Whence it is ever by the old fathers called a *communion*, as the priest was never supposed to receive alone. Whilst thou hast, for these fifteen last years, received all alone without any distribution to others. Thou hast been never forbidden to do otherwise. What kind of ordination or consecration is this! What sort of priest hast thou been, ministering to thyself alone, and not to the church! Such ordination is unknown to Christ.'

'Thirdly, it was the true intent of Christ, that at the celebration of the sacrament, a discourse should be heard of his passion and death, according to the text. Do this in remembrance of me! That is, shew forth my death, until I come! as St. Paul says. But thou! O! Popish! and corner Priest! hast never once confessed Christ at all, in all thy private masses. No! alone hast thou received, alone hast thou mumbled: is this fulfilling the will of Christ! to be a true priest?'

'Fourthly, the sacrament is common to *all*, whilst thou wert ordained to offer it to God alone, not as a priest of the sacrament but of oblation, according to the express words of the suffragan bishop.' See how well old Nick knew his ordainer! 'On putting the chalice into thy annointed hands, saying accipe potestatem consecrandi, et offerendi pro vivis et mortuis. Receive a power to consecrate, and to offer both for the living and the dead. O! abomination! What a shameful consecration! That you a private, should make *that* an oblation to the Almighty, which he has ordered to be (through you) distributed as food to all mankind.'

'Now, if thou hast been made priest against the will of Christ, thy ordination is false, antichristian, and vain. Consequently, thou hast never consecrated truly, but didst offer plain bread and wine, though thou didst receive it, adore, and shew it to others for the same purpose. Besides, in thy mass there is no one able to consecrate. None to whom thou mayest impart the sacrament, no! but thou O wicked und faithless priest! dost remain there alone, thinking that Christ hath ordained all for thy sake *alone*, there being none then to consecrate, nor to receive; and Christ's will being defeated, thy ordination and consecration is no more than a temptation and blasphemy before God: Nor art thou a priest, or is the bread in thy mass changed into the body of Christ.'

'Finding myself so pressed,' says the friar, and certainly a personal contest with so formidable an adversary might dismay any man. 'I thought to chase

Satan from me, by the old popish shield, the faith, and the intention of the church: For though I might not have believed as I ought, yet the faith and intention of the church being good, I therefore supposed my mass and ordination so too. Nonsense!' says the Devil, 'shew me where it is written,' see how fond he is of the bible alone! 'that an infidel can consecrate according to the faith and intention of the church? Where has God told you such a thing? or where has the church taught it? If men have so said against God's word, it is false: but this it is, that you do all such things in the dark, in the church's name, selling your own abominations for ecclesiastical doctrine.' Exit Satan. And thus ended this famous and long conference, the enemy victorious. The Doctor congratulating himself on his deliverance from mass, and the other errors of popery. 'Viderint,' says he, 'nunc Papistæ, quo modo sua defendant.'*

INTELLIGENCE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.—STATISTICS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.—There are 16 sees, 17 bishops, and 478 priests, of whom 370 are employed in missionary labours, and 108 in other functions, chiefly in teaching. There are 418 churches or chapels, of which there are 61 in the diocese of Baltimore, 71 in Philadelphia, 49 in New York, 40 in Bard's-town, and as many in St. Louis; 34, New Orleans; 30, Boston, &c. Many other chapels are being erected. Besides chapels, there are 341 stations where divine service is performed. The Jesuits, the Dominicans, the Fathers of St. Sulpice and of St. Lazarus, have establishments in the United State. The Jesuits have a college at George Town near Washington, another at St. Mary in Kentucky, one at St. Louis in Missouri, and one lately established at Grand Coteau in Louisiana. They have two noviciates at Frederick Town in Maryland, and one at Florissant in the diocese of St. Louis. The Indian Missions in the east and the north of Missouri, are under their charge, and employ four priests in this work. The Dominicans have two establishments, one at St. Rosa in Kentucky, and the other at St. Joseph in the State of Ohio. The Sulpicians have a seminary at Baltimore, besides a college numerously attended. The Lazarists have a seminary, a college, and a noviciate at Barrens, in the diocese of St. Louis. They have also the direction of a seminary for the diocese of New Orleans. Seminaries are also established in the dioceses of Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, Bard's-town, St. Louis, Cincinnati, Charles Town, and Vincennes. There are 171 ecclesiastical pupils. There are 31 female communities, 45 boarding schools, and 69 charitable institutions. The most common communities are those of the Ladies of Visitation, the Carmelites, the Ursulines, the Sisters of Charity, the Sisters of St. Clare, the Ladies of the Sacred Heart, the Dominicans, the Sisters of Loretto, the Sisters of St. Joseph, the Sisters of Mercy. The Ladies of the Sacred Heart have five houses, at St. Louis and Florissant, St. Charles, in the diocese of St. Louis, and at the Grand Coteau, and St. Michael, in Louisiana. The Sisters of Charity have a great number of schools and orphan asylums, principally at Philadelphia and New York. There are six Catholic Journals published in the United States, viz.: the *Catholic Miscellany*, published at Charles Town; the *Truth Teller*, at New York; the *Catholic Telegraph*, at Cincinnati; the *Catholic Herald*, at Philadelphia; the *Catholic Advocate*, at Bard's-town; and a journal, in German, titled, *Der Wahrheit's Freund* (the Friends of Truth) at Cincinnati.—*Cath. Mag.* May 1839.

* Luther, Tom. 7. Witt. 1588. Fol. 443. Tom. 6. Germ. Fol. 28.

Printed by Messrs. W. Rushton and Co., Calcutta, for the Proprietors price one rupee per month, or ten rupees per annum in advance. To non-subscribers 8 annas per number.

THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

'One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.'

NO. XI.

SEPTEMBER 14 1839.

VOL. I.

Weary of desultory warfare, but afraid of defending himself on his own ground 'the Bible the sole rule of faith,' which we have attacked, the *Christian Advocate* has thought it most prudent to lay siege in form to the rock-based fortress of the Catholic Church, and under the direction of the great engineer Dr. Horne, to open a battery at once upon ten of its points, which if he fail to injure by this general discharge, he intends utterly to demolish by bringing all his force and skill to bear upon each one successively. The ten points are, 'the insufficiency of the Bible as a complete rule of faith,' 'the Catholic canon of scripture,' 'the Church the judge of the sense of the scriptures,' 'not every one's duty to read the scriptures,' 'Infallibility,' 'Supremacy of the Roman Church,' 'objects of worship—Saints and Images' 'manner of worship—pilgrimages and the use of the Latin language.'—'The mass, a denial of the complete atonement of Christ,' and lastly 'justification by works as well as by faith.' This array we confess presents a formidable appearance; and if we had not, by the former cannonading of the *Advocate*, discovered what was the real length of his guns and the weight of his metal, we might perhaps be alarmed; for though we have the utmost confidence in the strength of our position, because it is the ground of truth, yet we mistrust our abilities to defend it as it deserves.

The *Advocate* starts with the proposition that the Bible is the test by which he means to prove the soundness or unsoundness of the Catholic doctrine, and the Bible he calls 'the word of God.' God's word undoubtedly is a certain and an awful test. But how does he know, except by the authority of Fathers and of Councils and of the Catholic Church, which authority he rejects, that the Bible is 'the word of God?' How can he ascertain which of the present translations is conformable to the original scriptures, some of which have perished, and the rest have become much corrupted? How does he know that the one which he adopts is correct or at least the best? How is he certain that he has the whole Bible? that many books have not been lost? that several passages have not been interpolated? How can he discover that the translated book called the Bible and printed by book-sellers at Cambridge or Oxford, is the *inspired word* of God? that the Latin, Greek and Chaldaic translations were *inspired*? that the original scripture, whether in Greek or Hebrew, really emanated from the holy spirit of God? We have at most but copies of the original

W

scripture ; but these copies no where affirm how many books were inspired or that they were inspired at all ; and if they did, their unsupported self testimony would fall to the ground.

Waiving these unpleasant questions which we know are very distasteful to the Evangelical spirit of the *Advocate*, we should be happy at least to learn by what means he is assured, that his peculiar biblical interpretation, which in fact, and not the Bible, is the test by which he means to try our doctrines, is correct and true ; for if this be false, then he judges our doctrines by a false test.

A book is a true or a false test according to the true or false meaning attached to it. In the Bible there is but one true interpretation ; if a wrong meaning be given to the bible, then the word of God becomes the word of man. The *Advocate* adduces the Bible as a test. But how interpreted ? By himself ; for he claims the right of interpreting it as he likes. The interpretation then is the *Advocate's* : so by trying our doctrine on the test of the Bible, he means no more than to prove it on the touchstone of his own fancy which already condemns it. Let the *Advocate* take as his test the holy scriptures, but the holy scriptures interpreted in that one meaning which their divine author attached to them ; which was delivered by the apostles to their successors ; which has been carefully handed down with the scriptures themselves ; which admitted in every church and in every age cannot be false. But no ! The *Advocate* must use the Bible as a test, but the Bible explained *after his fancy*. Excellent device ! As if any Catholic doctrine which he does not relish, will not readily enough be condemned by the Bible interpreted by himself, or as if any strange doctrine, which he may wish to foster, will not quickly find nourishment and support from the Bible strained through his imagination. The Bible or the word of God explained by the *Advocate*, is nothing but the word of man. It is the meaning alone which is of value in the Bible, and the meaning is the *Advocate's*. The words of the Bible are the shell, the true meaning of them the kernel.

The *Advocate* holds up the Bible, which, like a grub-eaten nut, his private judgment has cankered, and calls it a test. His cry is, ' the Bible, the whole Bible and nothing but the Bible : ' but he means the Bible where the grub of private opinion has burrowed. We, on the contrary, say ' the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.' We want not only the shell but the kernel too. We wish for that true meaning which Jesus Christ attached to his words when he spoke them ; which the apostles understood and received ; which as a most sacred deposit they entrusted to their successors ; and which untainted has been handed down to us. This true meaning, which can be but one, is, with respect to the articles of Catholic belief, attested by a host of Fathers, and by the voice and practice of the faithful in every age. It cannot be false, because it is Catholic : because it rests on the testimony of the Fathers and Bishops, who vouch for the Bible itself ; because it rests on the authority of the Catholic Church, to which Christ has promised, not to preserve the words of the Bible—but something far more important—to teach ALL TRUTH to the consummation of ages. To prove the unsoundness of the *Advocate's* doctrine, we too adduce the Bible as a TEST, but the Bible explained, not by our frail judgment, (no ! we leave such a method to the coy and blushing modesty of the *Advocate*), but by the above-said traditional interpretation, which, independent of the *Expositor* not less than of the *Advocate*, can neither be perverted nor misunderstood. The Bible used as a test by the *Advocate*

is nothing in fact but his whimsical fancy. The Bible employed by us as a test is the whole word of God, because it is the divine book illumined with its divine meaning.

The *Advocate* supports his assertion with three texts of scripture, which of course according to his system he interprets for himself. But they are far from establishing the absurd proposition, that the Bible privately interpreted ought to be a test.

1°. *To the law and to the testimony ; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them. Isaiah 8.*

2°. *Prove all things ; hold fast that which is good. Thess. v. 21.*

3°. *Stand fast therefore in the liberty, wherein Christ has made us free and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Gal. c. 5. v. 1.*

The favourite text of Isaiah proves nothing. For though in the old law the Bible privately interpreted were the test of truth, it is no proof that this is the case in the new law. But it was not the test in the old law. Isaiah is speaking of Pythonical spirits and diviners who mutter in their enchantments, and says, that if their answers be not according to the law and the testimony, they must be condemned. Yes ! But the law and testimony spoke clearly and minutely not only in the words used, but still more in the received interpretation and long-established practice of the Jews. Though the old law was laid down so clearly as to the smallest points, yet the Pythonical spirits would soon have proved that their false prophecies were consonant with it, if its interpretation had been left to them. But there was a well-known, wide-spread, and long-standing interpretation, handed down from him, who gave and promulgated the old law, and coeval with its birth. The law thus interpreted, or the word of God explained by this traditional interpretation, was the test by which Isaiah ordered the prophecies of the diviners to be tried, not the silent, unresisting, dead letter of the law which could be wrested to any meaning. Moreover, it is certain that the old testament was not left to the private interpretation of the Jews, as there was a divinely-chosen priesthood, whose office it was to decide on controverted points, and a succession of inspired prophets, who at certain times were sent to correct abuses, expound the law, and reveal the behests of God.

2°. *Prove all things ; hold fast that which is good.* St. Paul like Isaiah alludes to prophesying. Prove all things. Yes ! But how ? By the scriptures ? The greatest portion of the new testament, the most important part of the scriptures to us, was not written at the time ; and if they had been written, the greater number of Christians would have been unable to read them, either from not knowing how to read, or from want of copies. There must needs however, be a certain test ; for St. Paul says, ‘ Prove all things’. What is the test ? Why, to be sure, the well-known gospel-doctrine taught by the apostles and believed by the faithful ; the voice of the Church who, says St. Paul, is the pillar and the ground of TRUTH. This is the true test ; and it is unlucky that the *Advocate* did not discover it ; for when he was reading ‘ *Prove all things, hold fast that which is good,*’ he was close upon a correlative passage which would have made every thing as clear as the day. *Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word or by our epistle.* 1. Thes. c. 2. v. 15. See ! here is a test ; Hold fast what has been delivered ; Stick to what has been taught ; *Prove all things* by the sound doctrine already received.

3°. *Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Gal. v. 1.*

If we had wished for the sake of amusement to defend the *Advocate*—

principle of the bible-test, we own that we should never have had the wit and ingenuity to bring forward the above passage from St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. It is indeed an admirable one ; for though it does not at all prove his principle, with which it has not the remotest connexion, yet the text, on account of the words ' LIBERTY' and ' FREE' which figure in it, sets the principle in the broadest light, whilst it is a happy practical illustration of gospel liberty which is claimed by it. St. Paul alludes not to each one's right of judging for himself ; but in the cited passage and throughout the whole letter, he treats of the liberty which the sons of God enjoy in being by faith in Christ emancipated from the bondage of the old law, and severely condemns the Galatians who would have wished to retain or enforce the ancient observances. For, he argues, man redeemed in the law of grace by Christ from the thralldom of sin, ought to be no longer under the yoke of the old law, which represented man still unredeemed, and in the bondage of sin. But the *Advocate*, finding in the text the words ' LIBERTY' and ' FREE', forthwith supposes that we have the liberty to reject the delivered interpretation of the bible, and are free to interpret it as our private spirit may direct. But this surely is not the great liberty of the sons of God. For St. Paul assures us, that we must captivate our understandings in obedience to Christ, and Jesus Christ himself orders us to submit our wills to the precepts of God. The cited passage proves as much that we have full liberty to commit the oldest sins the newest kind of ways, as that we are free to interpret the bible as we please. This liberty forsooth ! The bondage of being presented with the *right* meaning by the church, is infinitely preferable to the liberty of adopting a *wrong* one. When one is safe and snug in the steam-coach flying from Liverpool to London, and obliged to follow the right road, he feels little envy at the poor foot-traveller who has the wonderful liberty of going astray as often as he pleases. The only thing of value in the bible is its true meaning ; which if we possess, we care not for the liberty of rejecting it, and adopting a false one. No student boasts of his freedom in understanding Homer as he likes, but only then thinks himself happy when he is put in possession of the author's meaning. As well might the boys of the High School set at defiance the authority of masters and commentators, and claim the liberty of explaining the great poet after their own fancy, as Christians on the *Advocate's* principle vindicate to themselves the right of interpreting the Bible by their private judgment. The former would feel the ridicule and punishment of the master of the school. The latter, trifling in a matter of the utmost moment and acting against the clear dictates of reason, will not escape (we fear) the vengeance of the great Master of the world.

To-day we have only considered the test which the *Advocate* has chosen. We will afterwards defend the points attacked as occasion may require. Most of them we have already defended, and our defence has not been impugned.

We have received files of French papers of recent dates from which the following items of interest have been gleaned and translated.

All the letters which arrive from Africa mention, in terms of praise and admiration, the conduct of Monseigneur Dupuch and his fellow-labourers. The following is an article from Algiers to the *Messenger*.

Mgr. of Algiers has lately formed an Association of Ladies of Charity,

which will be of great service to the poor Europeans. Our good Bishop is not less beloved by the natives than by his own countrymen. He has resolved to visit as soon as possible our different establishments in Africa. The Hachem of Constantine lately wrote to him entreating him not to delay his visit to that town, assuring him that he is expected there with great impatience, and that as soon as his landing is known, there will be sent to Stora, the finest horse in the country, and also some mules that he may choose such of the animals as he may think will best become him. The Arabs see in our Bishop a true Marabout. This confidence and respect will in time enable that Prelate to render great services to our Government.

Philosophy deliberates.—Religion acts.—How many volumes have been beautifully written by Philanthropists on Prison Discipline, but how seldom did they ever attempt, to carry their schemes into effect. It is reserved to religion to commence every work of humanity and advantage to society! The Penitentiary founded at Bordeaux by Mgr. Dupuch for the purpose of preserving young prisoners from the contaminating influence of corrupt examples to which they were exposed in ordinary prisons, will serve as a model for other establishments of the same nature. It is after this plan that the Penitentiary of St. Peter at Marseilles was lately established for the reformation of young prisoners. The following will show in what terms the *Gazette du Midi* extols the benevolent institution, and how it appreciates its results :—

‘ Manual labour, silence after the hours of recreation, a severe but religious discipline, and the religious instruction or rather education which is afforded throughout the day to the prisoners, will greatly tend to promote an increase of these benevolent institutions. The Magistrates duly estimate the benefit of such establishments. Formerly when they beheld young delinquents at the bar, they shortened as much as they could the time of their imprisonment which they justly considered as a great evil, being more calculated to confirm juvenile offenders to their evil ways than to reform them : whereas they now prolong the term of captivity, assigned by law, which they know will turn to the moral and temporal benefit of the prisoner.—Thus by short imprisonment, crime will not escape punishment, and Religion will resume its true character—to correct the past and to ameliorate the future.’

At Marseilles as well as at Bordeaux, we are indebted to religion for these advantageous measures. Society owes many obligations to the Bishop who has with such benevolent ardor taken this work under his patronage, and to the priest to whom he has entrusted its direction. Mr. L'Abbé Fissiaux (to whom we were already indebted for the establishment of an asylum for poor girls) has gained by this a new title to the gratitude of his fellow countrymen.

The *Gazette du Midi* announces that Mgr. Isaie, a Chaldean Patriarch, wrote to Mr. Th. Alckusies the learned Naturalist, and informed him that a Nestorian Bishop had entreated of him to receive his abjuration, and to admit him with about six thousand of his followers into the bosom of the Catholic Church.—He acknowledged that there alone is salvation to be found. Every thing inspires us with a hope that such an example will contribute to the propagation of the true faith in the unhappy countries of Chaldea and Persia. A College for foreign Missions is to be established at Tauris in the last-mentioned kingdom. The Reverend Mr. Scafi, a Laza-

rist, who has conceived this plan, is gone to Paris to treat on this point with the Directors of the Central House.

We have had the pleasure of receiving the three first numbers of a new and much improved series of the *Madras Roman Catholic Expositor*. This is the first Catholic periodical that appeared in India; and we are happy to infer, from the improvements which the conductors have been enabled to effect in it, that it has been supported in a manner worthy of our Madras brethren. It is a very neatly got up monthly publication consisting of thirty-six closely printed pages of valuable matter,—and all for only twelve annas. Our readers will be able to judge of the spirit and talent with which it is conducted from the following introductory article to the new series. Our object being precisely the same, we need hardly say how sincerely, we wish our elder brother success. In the mean time, we shall be happy to receive the names of subscribers, for the *Madras Roman Catholic Expositor*:—

‘We are happy to announce to the public, that we are at length enabled to fulfil our promise of conducting the *EXPOSITOR* on a more enlarged plan and more in conformity with the first design of this publication. Our future numbers will contain original articles on the various subjects that ought naturally to find a place in a Periodical, principally intended for the exposition and maintenance of Catholic Doctrines. Although literary and scientific subjects will occupy a considerable portion of our future publications, still they must be considered as secondary to the grave and engrossing concerns of Religion. In the nature of things, it is our highest interest not less than our principal duty to seek information on those truths, on which all our conduct and future destiny depend. Nor is there a portion of the Christian world in which Catholics have laboured under greater difficulties in the fulfilment of this primary obligation than they have in India. Without any opportunity of receiving a Catholic education, without Catholic works of instruction, with a Priesthood insufficient in number and unacquainted with the language of an important portion of the Catholic community,—Our Catholic brethren throughout India must have had, in many instances, no more knowledge of their Religion than that which they retained in the half effaced impressions of early youth.—Deceived by the false notions which they imbibed in institutions, that have been erected for the avowed purpose of promoting apostacy from the Catholic Church, or on the plan of secretly undermining the Catholic faith, it would not be a matter of surprise, if they formed for themselves an uncertain and a mixed creed, or if totally ignorant of what they should believe, and unawed by instruction or the example of pure morality, they became indifferent about their obligations, and now and then renounced the religion, which condemned their irregularities or seemed to throw an obstacle in the way of their promotion. Such would be the natural consequences of the unprovided state of the Catholic missions, and of the active, disciplined and well rewarded labours of the enemies of the Catholic religion. For whilst the Church suffered from her own children, the efforts of her opponents became more violent; and had they been directed against a human institution, they would have unfailingly proved successful. The wealth of the mother country was piously draughted hither; the contributions of England purchased Presses, organized and paid societies, published reports, printed books, gave circulation to periodicals, and all these exertions were mainly directed to one object—to bring into disrepute and thus overturn in India that religion, which had exhibited to the people of England and Ireland the impotency of such an opposition. At the very time the *CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR* was first published, was not the Catholic religion misrepresented, and the violence of a home faction transferred to the public prints of this country? Were not some of the worst of calumnies, which had been revived in Europe, without regard to honour or propriety for the purpose

of aiding a political struggle, zealously circulated here? These things have passed away and we now refer to them, only to rejoice the more, that a kind and Christian spirit has succeeded to replace them by forbearance and by works of mutual benevolence.

The Catholic religion by its constitution is opposed to contention and discord. Revealed for the instruction of all times and of all nations, it sanctions and strengthens every just and reasonable institution. Enforcing obedience to authority not merely from fear but for conscience sake, it lays the only solid foundation of public order. It consecrates the domestic virtues, nourishes all the charities of life, and commanding us to overcome evil by good and to have love for one another, it would bind all men like the children of the same parent in unity, peace and charity. We therefore never seek controversy; and we would for ever disregard even misrepresentations and calumnies had they no other effect than to withdraw from our communion a few of those worldly minded, nominal Christians, who by thinking more on this world than on futurity, have changed eternity into nothing and nothing into eternity; who are attracted more by the consolations of fashionable society and worldly promotion than by the promises of religion; and who passing from the bosom of the Church only to transfer their vicious morals and sentiments to another communion, become less noxious by being further moved from the parent they had dishonored. The only motive which could induce us to mix in controversy would be, to secure simple minded, moderate and liberal men from the effects of constant misrepresentation. For even such men cannot refrain from affording credit to statements that are continually renewed and never contradicted. They must view our religion through the false medium which is steadily held before their eyes; and thus is their love of truth made available to decry doctrines which they really do not know. There was a time, when prejudice thus spread like a contagion through the soundest parts of the community, and men artfully prepared a rank soil for the growth of indifferentism, contention and schism.—But things have changed—the tide has turned. The events of the last three years prove that although the triumph of the truth may be stayed, it cannot be prevented. A spirit has again breathed upon the dry bones, religion is revived and according to its nature is active in working good. The more we look into the present prospect the wider and the more consoling it becomes. In the hope of giving an impulse to what has been commenced, of instructing the ignorant, of exciting the indifferentist to think, of removing prejudices which designing men have created, of placing the Catholic religion plainly and simply before the mind of candid enquirers, of exhibiting in unstained beauty ‘the milk white hind which must be loved as soon as it is seen;’ in this hope of contributing somewhat to the advancement of true religion, will our labours be zealously devoted to the forthcoming numbers of the *EXPOSITOR*. The *EXPOSITOR* is the only Catholic periodical in India; we therefore calculate upon the support of those who profess the Catholic religion, or who wish to see its principles unencumbered by the mis-statements of those who either intentionally or through ignorance lead others into error. We have promised not to overlook literature and science, and in fact there is a natural connection between these and the main subject that is to engage our attention. The Catholic Church has proved herself the mother not only of religion but also of the arts and sciences and of civilization. This assertion may appear a paradox to those who have read the history of our Church in the calumnies of our adversaries; but a little serious and impartial reading will convince them how much they have been deceived. At all times and especially when Pagan barbarity poured the tide of destruction over Europe, when in the convulsion of states and empires all the labour of the arts and all the discoveries of science had almost perished. Learning took sanctuary in the Churches; the same hand that fed the lamp of religion guarded with equal care the lamp of science, and faithfully secured it, until the voice that issued from the Sanctuary, like the word of the Hebrew Prophet, dispelled that worse than Egyptian darkness that brooded over the face of the distract-

ed Kingdoms of the West. Our future pages will prove that this is not an unfounded panegyric or the vain assertion of one who has not looked into history. In the confidence of fulfilling our promises we commend the *EXPOSITOR* to the attention of a liberal public.

CATHOLIC FREE SCHOOLS AT CHITTAGONG.

We are happy to announce that the Catholic Free Schools which were last year established in Chittagong by the indefatigable zeal of the Revd. Mr. Goiran, are in a flourishing state; and will, we trust, be the means of ameliorating the moral condition of the rising generation of poor Christians at that station. During last year one hundred and ten were admitted into the Boys' School but only thirty-six into the Girls': the Revd. Pastor laments that the value of female education is so little appreciated by parents in general. The liberal and benevolent conduct of Mr. Harvey, the Commissioner, is the universal theme of grateful acknowledgment among the Catholics of Chittagong. The Catholic Free Schools, from which so many beneficial results are confidently expected, are chiefly indebted to his generous and fostering care for their existence. This meritorious public officer appears to be fully aware that it is religious instruction which makes the poor virtuous in the dark, and honest without a witness. The system of education observed in these schools consists of English Grammar, Arithmetic, Geography, the Bengalee language, and such other branches of practical knowledge as tend to render the pupils industrious and useful members of Society. We understand that a public examination will take place in December for the satisfaction of subscribers, and of which we expect to be enabled to give a full report. Notwithstanding the strictest economy, consistent with efficiency, the expense of these institutions must necessarily be great, and the means at the Rev. Gentleman's disposal are very inadequate. He has therefore resolved to appeal for support to the pious liberality of the Catholics of Calcutta, and we feel assured that the appeal will not be made in vain. Indeed, we cannot imagine an object more deserving of pious support than those which he has in view. 'They who instruct others unto justice, shall shine like stars to all eternity.'

Subscriptions towards his laudable undertaking will be most thankfully received by the Revd. Gentleman, who is at present in Calcutta, and residing at No. 217, Bow Bazar.

THE KNIGHT OF THE LONG TONGS.

A strange fish ! were I in England now, (as once I was) and had but this fish painted, not a holiday fool there but would give a piece of silver ; there would this monster make a man ; any strange beast there makes a man. Legg'd like a man ! and his fins like arms !—*Tempest*.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—A few days ago as I was standing at sun-rise on the extreme verge of the wooden wharf at Banks-Hall Ghaut, inhaling at long draughts the morning breeze as it came fresh up the river, and feasting my eyes with the sight of the countless vessels that rose tapering from its bosom in every symmetrical variety of beauty and majesty, I suddenly felt my arm seized and pushed with a jerk forward, which would have hurled me into the deep water below, if the hand which had given the jerk had not as suddenly staid it. I instinctively threw myself backwards, and with such

force, that I staggered several paces from where I had stood, before I could recover my balance. I instantly came forward with a full determination to punish the delinquent, when, just as the words 'you scoundrel' were on the tip of my tongue, I caught the eye of my little frolicsome friend Will Morven, who was leering up at me with such an inexpressible grin of self-satisfaction as at once to disarm me of my anger.

You rascal. Will, said I,—in a tone wherein mirth and vexation strove which should be uppermost,—what do you mean with your tricks so early in the morning?

Why, Steph, what do *you* mean by being in such a dull, stupid, thoughtful mood? It is less strange for Will Morven to play a trick before sun-rise than for Stephano ever to be pensive and serious! What, the plague, has come over you, that you should be standing here with folded arms like a love-sick stripling, and gazing steadfastly on the water as if you meant to throw yourself into it? Oh! I know now! Nettled a little, eh! smarting at the cuff which the gallant knight gave you for being so officious in finding out monsters for him, eh? Don't like your compositions to be called puerile and full of low ribaldry, eh? Yes, I understand,—you are meditating some dire revenge against the many-helmed Knight.

It is true, said I,—wishing to strike in with the humour of my little wag-gish friend—that when you broke on my cogitations, I was thinking seriously of the Knight of the Long Tongs: but not how to take revenge on him. Bless you, Will, would you have me do mischief to the Champion of your Protestant Faith! I am the gallant Knight's faithful squire: shall I fall out with him because I got a rebuff from him? The plain fact is, that I was watching if I could see the Knight of the Long Tongs in the water, as for the last week he has not made his appearance to do battle against Popery. I am afraid he has made off with himself.

Upon my word Steph, you entertain no small conceit of yourself, if you think that the Knight has drowned himself in despair, on account of the drubbing you gave him.

What say you? The Knight drowned himself in despair! I give the Knight a drubbing, I, his faithful squire! Why, Will, you are uncommonly sharp this fine morning! Pray let me ask whence have you had your information?

From your own dear lips, Steph. Did you not tell me a moment ago that you were looking in the water for the Knight, who has not been seen for a week past?

Yes.

But you don't think he has drowned himself?

No;—he has too great a love of life to throw it away so wantonly.

Nor has been drowned by another?

Why, Will, who on earth would ever rob it of the laughter-moving Knight who keeps us in a weekly roar of merriment with his facts, and his reasons, and his quibbles, and his assumptions, and his fallacies? I, for my part, should be sorry to see even a hair from one of his heads fall. So would you, Will, I am sure, though he does infinite more mischief to your religion than to that of the Papists: for he is so strange a fish!

By the black spurs of the Knight, Steph. I'm a shotten herring if you are not as mystical, and unintelligible as he is. For a whole week in the waters of the river and not drowned! Why, said Will, bursting out into a loud

laugh—do you suppose him, with his favourite charger, now galloping about the bottom of the Ganges, in quest of adventure! ha! ha! ha!

Exactly so, I replied, regarding my giggling friend with a countenance of imperturbable gravity.

Indeed! quoth Morven,—looking up at me with such a comical side-leer as to put the gravest muscle of my face to the test,—and pray, what great monster of the river have you sent him against now?

I send him! Heaven bless you, my dear Will; it is the great august personage who equips him with scales, fins, legs, and a tail for every sort of strange adventure that has sent him to explore the depths and caverns of the Ganges, not I. I send him! Out upon you.

Pray, then, said Will,—screwing up and stroking his face to imitate my gravity as well as he could,—will you be kind enough to inform me against whom he is to fight in the Sacred Ganges?

If I conjecture rightly, it is against the great Jesuit chief, who, the Knight suspects, has no less than ten thousand Jesuits under his command—all below the water. Heavens, you alarm me! But what is the object of the Jesuits in collecting in such force under the Ganges?

Why, simply to come *above* it, the first opportunity, said I, when in one night they will make themselves masters of the Fort, murder the Governor General, either in council or out of it, defeat the whole British army, and destroy, yes Will, utterly destroy your Protestant religion.

Has the Knight of the Long Tongs good grounds for believing, asked Morven with as serious a countenance as he could keep, that there are Jesuits under the River? Does he really think this to be the case?

There can be no doubt of it, said I; for, look you, the Knight of the Long Tongs began six weeks ago to throw out hints, that there was a *regular Jesuitical conspiracy concocted* in this country not less than in Germany; that the Jesuits were the strength of the Papacy; that they were here *in great force*. Just before he disappeared, he with the tone, look and gesture of a prophet, cried out in the midst of this heathenish city, ‘Protestants, beware: be on your guard; strain every nerve, or Popery will walk over the ruins of Protestantism.’ Now what does all this mean? The Jesuits are here *in great force*. As they are not here *upon* the earth, it is certain they must be somewhere *under* it. Many reasons plead strongly, in the opinion of my Knight of the Long Tongs, for their locality being at the bottom of the Ganges. Pray, Morven, can you explain the cause of the ‘bore,’ or tell me the reason why so many men, who fall into the Ganges, are never once after seen to raise their heads above it as in other streams?

No!—said the merry little Morven, whose gravity began to sit very uneasy upon him, flickering about his rubicund face like a departing flame that still hovers over the red wick of an exhausted oil-burner,—No! but I should be very glad to hear the Knight’s opinion on the subject from the mouth of his squire Stephano, who seems to know his master’s mind so very intimately.

Well then, said I, the bore, which has puzzled the wits of so many sage philosophers, is caused (according to the Knight’s notion which can hardly be wrong) by a violent rush of the whole body of the Jesuits up the channel of the Ganges when at stated intervals they train and discipline their youth in military evolutions. He observes, that they advance in column along the west bank until they come opposite to

Calcutta, when they immediately deploy, in order to practise their intended attack on the city, causing the tide in great commotion to flow from shore to shore, and not up the stream as nature would direct it. As for sailors never rising above the surface of the stream when they have once sunk beneath it, all this he easily accounts for by supposing that these same shrewd, cunning, artful beings are ever on the alert below to catch every one that happens to fall overboard, when they forthwith proceed to jesuitize him under the water. Here Will's gravity in spite of all his efforts began to shake and flicker so violently that I thought it would have leapt from the red tip of his nose and gone out entirely. Mr. Morven, said I—assuming an air so grave and authoritative and deepening my voice to so impressive a tone as in a moment to freeze and bind the relaxed muscles of my friend's face—though you may deem the Knight's opinion ridiculous and absurd, there is much more weight in it, I can assure you, than you seem to be aware of.

Indeed! said Mr. William Morven.

It has, I continued, the strong testimony of history to support it. For it is a well known and undisputed fact, that in the reign of Charles I. when sects of various sorts began in myriads to swarm out of your Church of England, there was a rumour widely circulated, and strongly believed in London by the New Lights, that under the River Thames there were 20,000 armed Jesuits lying ready to burst upon the city, and overturn the state on the first favourable occasion. Though they never actually issued forth from the river, yet this is no proof that they were not under it, against the firm belief of so many holy evangelicals, who, with the aid of the Bible and the Spirit, could not have been so long terrified for nothing. Now, mind;—if Jesuits could live under the Thames, it is certain, you must allow, that it is easier and pleasanter for them to dwell in the warm stream of the Ganges. Was not the Knight then strong grounds for his opinion? What objection can you make against it?

Objection!—echoed Will, who now became earnest, because he thought he had me on the hip,—none but the very trifling one of utter impossibility. For how can Jesuits, who are men like ourselves, and who, as we Protestants admit, are most useful and learned men withal, how can they live under water? Come, Sir, your reason.

Pugh! Will, you are quite mistaken in your notion of the Jesuits. The Knight of the Long Tongs knows them better than you. You judge of them by their actions and their principles. But he studies them in the book of Revelations, which he particularly loves because it is obscure, and finds their character drawn out most accurately by St. John, *the Historian*. Hence he boldly declares that their founder St. Ignatius was an *impious wretch*, that they are monsters *without mercy, without charity, without virtue, Arminians* in principle, the *destruction* as well as *support* of the papacy, ravenous as sharks with whom they live, dreadful as locusts. Yes! He knows that they are the locusts spoken of in the 9th chapter of the Apocalypse, who are like horses prepared for battle, whose faces are like the faces of men, whose teeth are as the teeth of lions, whose breastplates are breastplates of iron, and the sound of their wings as the sound of chariots of many horses running to battle, who have tails like scorpions and with stings in their tails: who have the angel of the bottomless pit for their king, whose name in Hebrew is Abaddon, or in English 'A bad one,' corresponding exactly to the character of St. Ignatius. Stop, for heavens

sake Steph, interrupted Will Morven. It is all as the Knight and his squire wish to have it. I give up the point to you. Yes ! The bottom of the Ganges is alive with armed Jesuit locusts. If you be so lucky as to get a glimpse of the fight between the Knight of the Long Tongs and the great Jesuit chief, be sure you come in the evening to my house, where you will find me holding a tough argument on exclusive salvation with our good old friend Ben Pos (Bengal Expositor), and give us an account of the battle. But tell me, Steph, why does the squire Stephano, stand cowardly here on the beach, instead of accompanying his Knight in his aquatic expedition ?

In truth, Will, I am afraid : for, don't you perceive, I am not decorated with scales and fins nor even—with a tail ! Here, Will Morven, with a laugh, seized me by the hand, gave it a hearty shake, and turning on his heels, left me to enjoy from the wharf the delightful scenery of the Ganges.

STEPHANO.

Selections.

THE ALLIANCE BETWEEN POPERY AND HEATHENISM.

Letter III. Concluded.—Dr. Wiseman to Mr. Poynder.

3. Your next grand division is, Lights and Votive Offerings. As to the first, you have again a most respectable precursor in antiquity, worthy to keep company with Julian and Faustus. This is the heretic Vigilantius, who, as St. Jerome tells us, called it idolatry to have lamps always burning before the tombs of the martyrs.* You have seen the apostolical constitutions mention the practice with commendation, in company with incense. St. Paulinus and St. Jerome inform us, that tapers were burnt day and night in the church. The former says,—

‘ Clara coronantur densis altaria lychnis,
Lumina ceratis adolentur adora papyris,
Noctu dieque micant.†

In the works of St. Optatus, we have a list of the plate given up to the persecutors by Paul, Bishop of Cirta, among which are ‘*lucernæ argenteæ septem, cereopala duo,*’ *seven silver lamps, two candlesticks.*‡ And similar objects of church plate are mentioned in the acts of St. Laurence.

But here again, why is the practice of burning lights in the Jewish sanctuary overlooked ? Is there any the slightest moral impropriety, or essential evil, in the use of lights ? And if not, is it desecrated by having been formerly applied by the heathens to a false worship, as well as by the Jews to a true one ? The same is to be said of votive offerings. You erect a statue or a bust to a man whom you honour and admire ; this is a natural manifestation of good feeling and gratitude ; does it become wicked and abominable because as much was done by heathens to their fellows of old ? Even so, if a Catholic believes that he has received a favour from God, through the intercession of his saints, is he to be debarred from the public attestation of his conviction, and the open declaration of his gratitude, because heathens, who preexisted, naturally were

* Ep. ad Ripar. 53.

† ‘ The glorious altar, thickly crown’d with lights,

Is perfumed by the tapers’ odorous flame ;

Through day and night they shine.’—*Natal 3. S. Felicia.*

‡ Acta purgat. Cæciliani, p. 266.

the first to seize on the most obvious way of expressing these sentiments? Once more, Sir, it is the doctrine, and not its outward expression, that should have been attacked.

4. You quarrel greatly with our sacred vestments, which you say, 'for a Romish priest, are sufficiently numerous and puzzling; (p. 27) and in another place you manifest a particular abhorrence for the clerical tonsure. Puzzling and numerous they doubtless are to you, who do not know their names or understand them, but not so to Catholics. Why, Sir, to me the dresses of a doctor of divinity at Cambridge, three, I believe, in number, with their scarlet cloth, and rose-coloured silk, and sashes, and scarfs, and cassocks, and rich ermine capes, and full round sleeves, are perfectly unintelligible. Surely we are not to quarrel about the 'fashion of our doublets,' or raise controversy upon one another's dress. Nay, your clergy would look strange enough, if they observed their canons and that too not merely when in their churches, but in public places. For in the constitutions and canons ecclesiastical, not long ago reprinted, and therefore, I suppose, in force, it is ordained, 'that no ecclesiastical persons shall wear any wrought nightcap, but only plain nightcaps of black silk, satin, or velvet;' also that, 'in their journeys, they shall wear cloaks without sleeves, commonly called priests' cloaks, without guards, welts, long buttons, or cuts;' moreover, that in private houses, they may 'use any comely and scholar-like apparel, provided that it be not cut or pinkt: and that in public they go not in their doublet and hose, without coats or cassocks, and that they wear not any lightcoloured stockings.* But seriously speaking, if you would look into the meaning and antiquity of our sacred vestments, perhaps you would be a little surprised at the ignorance you have betrayed; and for this purpose, as well as others connected with the points I have briefly touched upon allow me to recommend to your perusal the excellent work of my very esteemed friend Dr. Rock, entitled *Hierurgia*, where you will find much that will be quite new to you. As to the tonsure, how there is more superstition in uncovering the head, by removing the hair, than in covering it by a wig, as the bishops of the establishment have heretofore been used to do—a laudable practice I believe, of late rather neglected—I am at a loss to see. St. Jerome tells us somewhere, that much hair on the head is only the fashion of dandies, barbarians, and military men—'*luxuria sorum, barbarorum et militantium*,' so that I think he would have preferred the diminution of real to the superaddition of factitious hair. In fact our practice, which, after all, is but a matter of discipline, is based upon very ancient canons, regarding the growth of hair in ecclesiastics. As to your comparison of the tonsure with the shaving of *all* the hair, practised by those employed in the rights of Isis, be so good as to consult their meaning, as explained by Synesius, and then you will see the difference.

I find I am getting involved in too detailed a controversy for my time and occupations; so that I will content myself with one or two more points, leaving the case in my reader's hands. For I believe that in a court of law, when you have disproved the accuser's testimony on several points, you prove him unworthy of credit in the rest.

You are greatly offended with the inscriptions over Catholic churches, which, after Middleton, you compare with those of heathens, and your eulogist in the *Times* decorated his columns with your comparative list. (p. 33.) The grounds of your dislike amount to this, that we, choosing to write in latin, go to pure models, and prefer good words and forms to barbarous or corrupt ones. Truly this is a monstrous delinquency, worse than the clerk of Chatham's, whom Jack Cade hung for 'setting of boys' copies, and having a book in his pocket with red letters in't.' If you choose to consider it as a matter of taste, I am with you. I would go farther to copy a pair of good old leonine verses with rhyme in the middle and end, than to take down the chastest inscription by Morcelli or Schiassi: and gladly would I, that the reformers had not, by their

derision of the simple style used in the Church, introduced that overweening taste for classical Latinity, of which you justly complain. Though I fear we do not agree even here; for you call the beautiful and moving hymn *Dies Iræ* an abomination! (p. 94.) But to make it a crime to use the same words as the Romans did in the dedication of a temple, while we write in the same language, is placing us in a sad dilemma between heathenism and barbarity. Yet I find that in the dedication of your churches to saints, which is, after all, a more serious matter than the forms in which it is done, the words used by the pagans are to be read; the church is styled *ædis*, or *templum* God is *Opt Mæx*, as Jupiter was, the saints are called *Divus*, the building is said to be *sacred* to them; and I find all your Latin writers who affect elegance, making use of these and similar words without scruple. Yet no one has called them heathens.

But, Sir, it would have been well for you to have verified your master's quotations before you repeated them: for you would not have found one of them correct. The first, though I see no harm in it, I do not believe exists in Boldonius or elsewhere; the second happens only to be like a phrase in Cicero, which surely is no sin, and contains, besides, in the original, a clear distinction between God and the saint; the third is garbled and dismembered; the fourth, composed by Polo, is quoted by Boldonius only to be criticised in the severest terms, as a most unjustifiable imitation of a pagan form: Beware, Sir, how you receive too implicitly the gifts of such men as Middleton,

κακοῦ γὰρ ἀνδρὸς δῶρ ὄνησιν οὐκ ἔχει.*

But I fear that however we may change our phrase, it will be difficult to escape the censure of *learned* travellers. For you will doubtless remember the fact, of one among that class, who dedicated his travels to a very zealous Protestant baronet, proving us to be idolaters from our calling the Blessed Virgin, on our churches, *Deipara*, which he translated, *equal to God*. However, to make some amends to you for having thus destroyed the interest of your inscriptions, I will give you a new one in their place, exceedingly popish, but, at the same time, very ancient. It was found two or three years ago in the ruins of Ostia, and is, I believe, as yet inedited.

ANICIUS AVCHENIVS BASSVS VC ET TVRRENIA HONO
RATACE EIVS CVM FILIIS DEO SANCTISQVE DEVOTI P.

This Anicius Bassus, who puts up a public inscription to tell us that he, his wife, and children, were *devout to God and the saints*, lived about there hundred and eighty years after Christ, and was no mean personage, having held the office of Proconsul of Campania, as appears from his numerous inscriptions in Gruter, Muratori, Fabretti, and others;† neither was he very much under the influence of papal rule, for he is mentioned in ecclesiastical history as having, with Marinianus the patrician, most calumniously accused Pope Sixtus; upon whose full justification, his goods were confiscated by Valentinian. So that this union of the saints with God in a common inscription, must have been the effect neither of ignorance or papal tyranny, but of universal belief and practice.

But what shall we say to the chapels and oratories, and still more the crucifixes and images, seen on the wayside in Italy, and more frequently in the land of the heroic Tyrolese! Your wrath is greatly inflamed against these high places of Popery, as you call them; (p. 32) for my part, I hold them to be among the most beautiful and touching characteristics of the country. I well remember one evening, toiling along the sides of Etna, over a black field of lava, without a single object around that could cheer a wearied traveller, not a tree or shrub, not a hut or other sign of human habitation, not a star in the heavens,

* Euripid. Med. 625.

† Gruter, 1090, 20 (ΑΝΟΥΠΙΑΤ. ΚΑΜΠΑΝ.) Murat. 467, 7; Fabretti, p. 100, n. 225; p. 261, 120.

or a reflexion oft'wilight upon our dreary road. But before us, at a distance, was one bright gleam, a brilliant point of steady light, which seemed the fairer for the gloomy desolation which surrounded us; and long we journeyed, conjecturing what that beacon could denote, whether the hovel of a peasant, or the watchfire of the shepherd,—till we stood before it and found it to be the lamp which some poor but pious neighbour had lighted before a Madonna in a niche on the wayside, on whose countenance it shed, amidst the solitude and silence of the place and time, a mild and cheering brightness. My companion, whose religion differed from mine, could not help observing how exquisitely beautiful and benevolent this simple act of rustic religion then appeared to him, and how cheerless the rest of the way would seem, after we had turned our back upon the Madonna's lamp. And in every part of the country, to see the little rustic altars, with their tribute of flowers exhaling a cloudless incense before them, and their fading garlands hung around, cannot but make one feel how completely, in the mind of the simplest peasant, the ideas of the holy and the beautiful are essentially united; and how their duty to God and his saints seeks to manifest itself with them, precisely as the affections of a child would be shown to the memorials of a departed parent.

In England too, Sir, there is no lack of images and representations of men upon the way side; there are the King's head, and the Queen's the Turk's and the Saracen's, set up at convenient distances beside the road, to invite the poor peasant to rites more unholy than a prayer to saints, which, as they pass, they do not merely, what you think so wrong, 'pull off their hats,' but they draw from their purse their wife and children's food and maintenance; whereby they are invited, not to such abominations as 'crossing themselves, or genuflecting,' but to go in and join Bacchanalian orgies, where their time, and morals, and health, are all wasted away. But woe to this happy land, if ever, instead of these pictures and images by the wayside, shall be seen those of Christ crucified, or of the angel announcing his incarnation to his virgin mother; such a change would be frightfully superstitious! Woe to its people, if ever they shall be seen reminded of good and holy thoughts by their emblems on the road, and heard to whisper a prayer as they pass an oratory by the way, rather than pay homage to the symbols of immorality and debauch! But, Sir, if we are all to have some images or pictures on the roads, give me the Tyrol with its crucifixes, and its brave peasantry, with their beads in their hands, when they go to work, and I will leave you those English representations, in which doubtless your zeal sees nought superstitious and unholy; and those who worship there, in whose conversation, as they pass along the road, you will surely find nothing to blame as a prayer to saints, or a thought about their existence. I am, &c.

(*From Catholic Magazine, for May, 1839.*)

ITALY.—Two Jews, Abraham and Cæsar Vienna, father and son, were received into the church at Corregio, in the State of Modena, on the 24th of March. The elder Vienna is a man of great literary acquirements, and is well read in the Scriptures.

The Italian journals speak with interest of a Chaldean named David, who some time ago abandoned the Nestorian heresy and entered the bosom of the church. By the zeal of the archbishop of Salmaden and his mission, the province of Aderbigian, (David's country,) lying between the Aries, Caspian sea, and Armenia, has united to the church; and David has been some time in Italy collecting money to raise a church for his fellow Catholics, and a college for the education of ecclesiastical students. He has been very successful in his *quête*, and well received wherever he went.

ROCHELLE.—During the last year, twenty-four conversions from Protestantism have taken place in the diocese of Rochelle, viz. thirteen males, and eleven females. A number more are under instruction.

AIX.—On the 17th of February, a young German, a Protestant, embraced the Catholic faith, and received conditional baptism in the cathedral.

TOLOUSE.—On the 29th December, the archbishop administered the sacrament of baptism, confirmation, and the eucharist to a converted German Protestant, named Peter Charles Henry Schobel, aged twenty-five years, a native of Magdeburgh.

CAMBAY.—The Catholic library of this town, which in 1836 amounted to 3272 volumes, was increased in 1837 to 4,600, and now amounts to 6,000 volumes. During the first year the readers did not exceed 800, but in 1838, they amounted to nearly 32,000.

CATEAU.—A library of Catholic books was established here in 1837, and in November of that year there were 490 volumes. It now consists of 591 volumes. Upwards of 1,200 persons avail themselves of the contents.

FLOWERS FROM THE HOLY FATHERS.

No. V.

‘Lignum pretiosius, lignum Crucis pretiosius, quam quælibet gemma diadematis.’—*Sti. Augustini in Psal. xxxii.*

HAIL, saving Cross! hail, sacred Sign!
More precious this than gold, approved
By threefold fire, or brightest gem:
Here at thy foot I would recline,
Most sure by this, how God has loved
The Catholic Jerusalem.

Here would I lay my weary thought—
Too weary long—too long oppress
Beneath the weight of sinful load:
Here would I seek repose long sought,
But sought in vain in the unrest
And tumult of Destruction’s road.

Here, ’neath the shelter-tree of life,
Is refuge from the pelting blast,
And shadow from the heat of day;
Here, from the burthen, jar, and strife,
Of empty trifles—passing—past;
Here would I rest away.

The troubled breast finds here repose,
And here the angry passions lull—
The sensual appetite is checked:
And here increase of love still grows
More pure, till its fruition full
UncLOUDS the opening intellect.

Hail, saving Cross! hail, saving Sign!
What gems of earth may countervail
That source of Love—that spring of Faith?
Oh, wondrous depth of love divine!
Once and again the Cross I hail,
Our only hope in life and death.*

* ‘O Crux, ave, spes unica!’—*Hymn. in Dom. Pass.*

Printed by Messrs. W. Rushton and Co., Calcutta, for the Proprietors,
price one rupee per month, or ten rupees per annum in advance. To non-
subscribers 8 annas per number.

THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

‘ One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.’

No. XII.

SEPTEMBER 21, 1839.

VOL. I.

We congratulate the *Advocate* on the fervour and energy with which he maintains the general assault he has begun on the Catholic Church. The roar of his guns is now heard on every quarter; and though the missiles which he sends, fly wide or fall short of her ramparts, we know better than to attribute the failure to any defect in his kind wishes and intentions. Besides the ten points which in his last number he attacked, he has now opened a formidable battery against five other points, ‘The number of our sacraments,’ ‘communion under one kind,’ ‘celebracy of the clergy,’ ‘purgatory and indulgences,’ and ‘auricular confession.’ It is true that there are two other points, viz. ‘the deposing power of the Pope’ and ‘no faith to be kept with Heretics,’ on which he has spent the greater portion of his skill, ammunition and force. But as they are nothing more than well-battered outworks which either have no connexion with the Church, or have been raised by her enemies as objects to level at and destroy, we cordially hope that the *Advocate* may have sufficient science to demolish them without leaving a stone upon a stone. We heartily unite with the *Advocate’s* correspondent *φιλοβιβλος* in praising the judgment and prudence which the great *Advocate* has shown in ordering and directing his attack upon the wide and large scale. For since, as the correspondent states, the *Advocate* has had greatly the disadvantage in the narrow defile, where, unable to escape, he was obliged to fight hand to hand, he could not have adopted a safer method than, at a distance around us, to keep up a constant loud roar of cannonading; and though to a deep-thinking public such a method may look like an acknowledgment of defeat, yet the *Advocate* is fully aware, that it secures him more from danger, while to the pious ears of his evangelical brethren, whose simple-mindedness alone he consults, the sound of victory is conveyed in the muttering thunder of his guns.

Leaving the *Advocate* to play upon the two outworks, which have been wisely thrown up by our adversaries that they might have something to demolish, we hasten to meet *φιλοβιβλος* ‘in the dark bushy tangled forest where we love to embosh.’ For this gentleman, whose courage excites our surprise as much as the *Advocate’s* discretion elicits our praise, has had the spirit and hardihood, if not to encounter us face to face in

close fight, at least to hover about the skirts of the tangled forest where our prowess, it seems, is so much to be dreaded.

This much of daring on the gentleman's part is highly deserving of eulogy; and he should have had our unqualified commendation, if, before asserting that the Bible ought to be the test of doctrine, he, without the aid of tradition which he rejects, had shown that the Bible is really the INSPIRED WORD of God, or that his interpretation has any more solid foundation than the vagaries of his own fancy. He would then have met us boldly to the face, and displayed his courage in attempting to beat down the dreadful weapons which are uplifted against him in the insufficiency of scripture as a rule of faith. He would not then have been forced humbly 'TO BEG THE QUESTION' as he must need now do, and suppose as true what it is incumbent upon him to prove. But it is cruel in us, we know, thus, at the outset to crush at once our gallant opponent, and take from him every chance of displaying his prowess. Granting him therefore, with all the courtesy of chivalry, that the Bible is the inspired word of God, (we cannot be so condescending even for a moment as to allow that his interpretation of it is anything more than his conceived notion,) let us see with what spirit and success he can maintain that the Bible alone ought to be the test; for this is the point which he has undertaken to prove; and verily we think that it alone is quite as much as his courage and abilities are able to achieve. He affirms then that the Bible ought to be the touchstone on which to try the truth and falsehood of doctrine, and he supports his assertion with the single text of Isaiah. *To the law and the testimony; if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them.* Though in our last number we completely wrested from the Advocate's hands this trusty text, which φιλοβιβλος can hardly be expected to retain with firmer grasp, yet, in courtesy to our fresh antagonist who adduces an old passage, we will honour him with a fresh method of defence. If this text of Isaiah shows that every Jew had the right to test the soundness of a doctrine by the Bible interpreted by himself, it is certain that the Bible must have been written in the language which every Jew understood, otherwise he could neither have exercised his right nor practised his duty. But from the time of the Babylonish captivity to the coming of our Saviour, the Bible existed only in the Hebrew language, while the people understood and spoke no other than the Syriac-Chaldaic; so that unable to read the Bible or know what was in it but by the interpretation of the Priests, whom in fact they consulted and were directed to consult, the Jews had no opportunity of exercising the glorious privilege of Gospel-liberty which modern reformers have so graciously bestowed upon them.

Yet this text of Isaiah, which is certainly the most plausible that our opponent can adduce, regards unfortunately the old law and cannot be made to apply to the new. This is a great disadvantage for our adversary; however as today we are so full of the spirit of courtesy, we will suppose that the above quoted passage flowed from the inspired pen either of St. Paul or of St. John. Will it serve to establish the Advocate's theory that it is the duty of each one to test the soundness of any doctrine by the Bible? If this be so, it was absolutely necessary that the Bible should exist complete and entire from the first dawn of Christianity; that there should be a sufficient number of copies; that it should be written in the languages which every one could read and understand. But the whole of

the new Testament was not written until sixty-four years after Christ ; parts only of it existed in many churches till the 4th century : and when these had been collected into the book called the Bible, the copies of it for centuries were necessarily extremely scarce. But this is not all. In the East during the first ages of the Church the Bible existed but in three languages, the Hebrew, Greek and Chaldaic : yet the Galatins, Cappadocians, Phrygians, Isaurians, and Egyptians had each their own peculiar tongue. How could they exercise their right in using the Gospel-test ? How could the Africans who early spoke the Punic language, or the Galls, Spaniards, and Britons who, in the 5th century, had each a language of their own, enjoy their great Gospel-privilege, when, till about the twelfth century, there was no translation known in the West but the Latin vulgate, which could only be read by the learned ?

This answer destroys the weight of the other passages which our Greek-named opponent has adduced ; passages which are undeserving of particular notice as they bear at most but indirectly on the point in question. But here let us pause. For our opponent, as if conscious of his inability to cope with us by means of his Bible-sword, grasps the huge folio of the Fathers, whose authority he does not admit, and advancing like the one-eyed Cyclops in the Odyssey with a rock in his hands, threatens blindly to crush us with the weight ! He brings forward the authority of St. Ignatius the martyr, and quotes this passage as if from Eusebius. *Ignatius taking his last leave of the Asian Churches as he went to Martyrdom, exhorted them to adhere close to the written doctrine of the Apostles, necessarily written for posterity.* Though the words of St. Ignatius are so completely changed by our opponent that they are made to express the very reverse of what the saint actually said, yet we do not mean to impute this to any want of candour or sincerity on the part of our adversary. No ! we are aware that, writing for such a paper as the *Christian Advocate*, it is very difficult for him not to catch unwittingly something of its spirit, which misrepresents doctrines, perverts texts, and invents facts without the least remorse of conscience. Besides, though he assumes a Greek name, it may be all the Greek which he has about him. Obligated therefore to take his texts on the credit of his less scrupulous brethren, he may not have been able to read the real sentence of St. Ignatius which runs thus. He exhorted them TO HOLD FAST TO THE TRADITION OF THE APOSTLES, *which tradition, confirmed by his own testimony, for the more sure information of posterity, he deemed it necessary to commit to writing.* The original stands thus : προὔτρπετε τε ἀπριεῖ ἐχεῖναι τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων παραδόσεως ; ἣν ὑπερ ἀόφαλειας, καὶ ἐγγραφως, ἡδὴ μαρτυρομενος, διατυπώθαι ἀναγκαῖον ἦγειτο.

We have been particular in giving the Greek text, with a view, to soothe as much as possible the grief of φιλοβιβλος, who will feel less pain at being convicted of gross misquotation, when he finds, that he has been caught in the fact by the great Greek Original Itself, and not by any impertinent lackey translation.

In the passage of St. Cyprian which is next brought forward, our opponent has not misquoted the text, but only perverted the meaning of it. *Whence is this tradition ?* says St. Cyprian to Pope Stephen. *Is it fetched from the authority of Christ in the gospel or of the apostles in*

the epistles? for God testifies that those things are to be done which are written. St. Stephen, who is acknowledged by Protestants to have been right, urges against St. Cyprian who was in the wrong, the force of tradition against rebaptizing heretics on their conversion. St. Cyprian denies not the *authority* of a tradition if it existed, but the *existence* of any such tradition: He therefore supports his cause, and very plausibly too, from scripture. That St. Cyprian admitted the authority of tradition is manifest from the same letter; for he says, *It is easy to minds that are religious and simple, to lay aside error and discover truth, for if we turn to the source of divine tradition, error ceases.* On this passage, St. Austin observes. *The advice which Cyprian gives to recur to the tradition of the apostles, and thence to bring down the series to our own times, is excellent, and manifestly to be followed.* *De Bapt. contra Donatistas, L, v, c, 26* The cited passages from other Fathers might be disposed of in a similar manner: but we are unwilling to triumph over a foiled antagonist.

If our Greek-named opponent is unfortunate in this his first attempt to enlist the Ancient Fathers on his side, he is not happier in the citation of the name of a modern author who, though he admits the principle of the Gospel-test in its full extent, does infinite injury to the cause of φιλοβιβλος. It is a name for which we feel so deep a veneration, that if any man's exalted talents could move us against the universal testimony of the Catholic Church, we undoubtedly should be swayed by it. We allude to Milton, who with warm devotion and clear intellect followed up the great principle of the Gospel-test with such accuracy, as to deny the divinity of Christ and to affirm the lawfulness of polygamy. Our opponent in good sooth is very likely to convince the Mussulmans and Hindoos of Christ's Divinity and of the unlawfulness of polygamy by urging the bare authority of the Bible, which, in the judgment of Milton, a Bible-Christian, and a most talented man, asserts and establishes neither the Divinity of Christ nor the unlawfulness of polygamy. The Mussulmans will thank φιλοβιβλος for teaching them from Milton how to use the Bible-test. Able now to cope with the *Advocate* on his own ground, they will pierce him with his own weapon, and prove, like Milton, from the BIBLE, that Christ is not God, and that they can have as many wives as they like. What reply can the *Advocate* make? But hush!—Oh! *tell it not in Gath: publish it not in Ascalon; lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice, the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph!*

A CLEAR EXPOSITION OF THE FOUR CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TRUE CHURCH.

Even our separated friends avow that the 'FOUR CHARACTERISTICS' essentially appertain to the True Church. They profess it in the words of the Nicene Creed, which they have borrowed from us and adopted: '*I believe in One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.*' Hence if we demonstrate that those four notes belong to, and can be discovered solely in the Roman Catholic Church, it will be undeniable that she ALONE is the True Church of Christ.

Our Church is ONE. No sect without her pale professes unity in its doctrines. As idolators do not bend their knees to an idol common to all, but on the contrary have as many different objects of worship as

they themselves differ in locality and manners, so our heterodox brethren vary in their doctrinal dogmas. Their '*different denominations*,' arising from the discrepancy of their tenets, have been by us enumerated in a previous number. They resemble a martial phalanx battling with itself, or to be more scriptural, they are much like Pilate and Herod, who united indeed to persecute the Redeemer of the world, while till then they had been mutual enemies. This is the triumph that God promised over the subjects of the Pharaohs: 'I will set the Egyptians to fight against the Egyptians.' (Is. xix. 2.) From the very infancy of the Church the Simonians scuffled with the Simonians, the Marcionites with the Marcionites, the Donatists with the Donatists, and the Arians with the Arians, (as we learn from authorities respected by our opponents themselves, an Irenæus, an Epiphanius, an Augustine and a Hilary) just as in our times Calvinists war with Calvinists, Lutherans with Lutherans, and Anglicans with Anglicans, who are at so much variance with each other, that in one heterodox city the professors of that faith do not agree in admitting the same articles! and although all denominated *Protestants*, they are widely discrepant in their religious *protests*. The Egyptians are set against the Egyptians. The father of the so-called reformation, Luther himself, by changing his opinion on the Eucharist no less than THIRTY-SIX times warred thirty-six times with himself. The Augsburg confession, which is the Lutheran rule of faith, is as different in the substance of its dogmas, as are its editions. Melancthon, Zuinglius and Calvin are so inconstant in their doctrines, that volumes of their contradictions have been compiled. And can such discrepant opinions have the character of truth?

We are aware that Calvin in the 4th book of his institutions, followed by other sectarians, has aimed a blow at Catholicism with the very argument, that we are now handling, on the plea that it is split into many Religious Orders, and as others subjoin, lacerated by the contrariety of theological opinions. But with regard to the Orders, whoever is acquainted with them, knows that they do not divide the Church; on the contrary, like unto the troop of a garrison, glittering with divers colours according to the diversity of their regiments, and known by various names of Dragoons, Fusiliers, Lancers and Grenadiers, but all forming only one guard of defence, the religious orders with different habits, which constitute their ecclesiastical uniform, possessing divers names, and following different institutes, all form but one garrison of the same identical Church. With reference to the variety of theological opinions, our divines differ, it is true, in *scholastic*, but not in *dogmatical* doctrines: they are not agreed, for example, who is the minister of the sacrament of Matrimony, whether the clergyman, or the contracting parties, but they all admit and believe that matrimony is a sacrament. In this they comply with the entreaties of the Apostle: 'Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, *and that there be no schisms among you*; but that you be perfect in the same mind, and in the same judgment.' (1. Cor. I. 10.) It is the same case with them as with Physiologists, who are mutually at variance concerning the nature of motion, the formation of the blood, and of living animals, but all agree in admitting motion and the formation alluded to. Thus the Thomists differ with the Scotists, for example, in *what manner* efficacious grace is compatible with free-will, but they both avow that the one exists with, and does not destroy the other. Our divines harbour a multiplicity of

opinions, but profess ONE only faith. And hence we may deduce a powerful argument in favour of the truth of our church. Schools mutually opposed, partly moved by emulation, partly incited by self-interest, and partly stimulated by public advantages, are all agreed in defined articles of Faith: their love of truth, obedience to the church, and the profession of Catholicism prevail over their private interests or party feelings; in a word there is among them but ONE FAITH. But why do we speak of a few schools? From the beginning of Christianity four Evangelists, eleven Apostles and seventy-two Disciples were scattered through the globe. It would appear impossible that such a number of teachers, widely separated from each other, could have been constantly united in the same doctrines, but truly such was the case: ONE FAITH. There have been convened, besides that of the Apostles, since the commencement of the Church, twenty ecumenical or general councils, in different countries, at different times, and against different errors. There have sat on the chair of Peter, including his present Holiness Gregory XVI., two hundred and fifty-eight Pontiffs of different ages, of different nations, of different inclinations, and even of different morals; they have published numberless Bulls, defined (*not formed*) articles of faith, condemned erroneous propositions, and never (as may be seen in the dissertations of any controversialist) have either they or the councils erred in a single item of faith. ONE FAITH, ONE FAITH.—Still more. An opinion condemned by the Vatican, is condemned without remonstrance, or discussion by all the Catholic Schools and Academies of the world. In the whole Catholic world the same precepts are inculcated, the same counsels commended, the same sacrifice offered, and the same sacraments frequented. ‘The Church of Rome,’ says St. Jerome, (*Epist. ad Evandrum*) is not one, and that of the whole world another. Gaul and Bithynia, Persia, India and all barbarous nations adore one Christ, and observe *one* and the same rule of faith. It is indubitable, that concord is a constituent of God’s Kingdom, as discord is of the demon’s: ‘For God is not the God of dissension, but of peace: (1 Cor. xiv. 33); if then the Catholic religion *alone* is a religion of unity and concord, it *alone* is of God; and being alone of God, it *alone* must be the TRUE RELIGION.

(*To be continued.*)

MASSACRE OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW.

There are perhaps few things of which the majority of our Protestant brethren are more thoroughly persuaded than that persecution is a tenet of the Catholic Religion: no opinion, however, could be more erroneous. Admitting that Catholics have persecuted, that Bishops, nay even Popes, have abetted persecution, it by no means follows that they did so in virtue of any tenet of their religion. There is no crime in the black catalogue of iniquity of which Catholics have not been guilty, and all their enormities might with quite as much reason and justice be imputed to their religion as the persecutions of which some of them have been guilty. Why should the Catholic religion, which breathes nothing but the purest spirit of charity, be blamed, because some who profess it, disregard its most sacred mandates? It is true that Catholics as well as Protestants have persecuted; but we believe that neither ever did so out of purely religious

motives. Wordly policy or revenge were the real motives ; religion was merely assumed as a pretext : ‘ Death, pains, and confiscations,’ says O’Leary, ‘ on the score of conscience, when the religionist behaves as a peaceable subject, are the ungracious offspring of lawless rule. Tyranny begot it : ignorance fostered it : and barbarous divines have clothed it with the *stolen* garments of religion.’

That persecution is repugnant to the mild spirit of the Catholic religion is abundantly evident from its history for at least the first thousand years of its existence. The famous saying of Tertullian that ‘ *It is not the province of religion to force religion,*’ seems to have been adopted as their motto by the Fathers. Saint Gregory the Great, who lived in the sixth century, and knew the obligations of religion as well as any of his successors, wrote to a Bishop who had caused one of his clergy to be beaten for heresy, that it was an unheard of and novel method of preaching the Gospel, to enforce faith with the cudgel.

No heretical sect could be more dangerous in a state or more injurious to society than the Priscillianists. Their doctrine was condemned in a council in Spain ; but their persons left at liberty. Two Spanish Bishops, Ithacius and Ursacius, solicited Maximus to put Priscillian to death. Hence St. Martin of Tours, and all the Bishops of Gaul and Spain would never communicate with those sanguinary prelates, who were afterwards banished. Even a council that was held refused to admit any Bishop who held communion with one Felix who had concurred in the accusation of Priscillian, and whom the Fathers therefore call ‘ *a murderer of heretics.*’

The council of Toledo forbids the use of violence to enforce belief : ‘ Because,’ add the Fathers, ‘ God shows mercy to whom he thinks fit ; and hardens whom he pleases.’ And the council of Lateran, under Pope Alexander the III., acknowledges that the Church rejects bloody executions on the score of religion : which proves that the persecuting Canon attributed to the fourth council of Lateran, under Innocent the III., is spurious ; a fact which is indeed admitted by some learned Protestant writers. ‘ The Spirit of the Church,’ says Fleury ‘ was in such a manner the spirit of meekness and charity, that she prevented, as much as in her power, the death of criminals and even of her most cruel enemies. St. Augustin accounts for this conduct in his letter to Macedonius, where we read that the Church wished there were no *pains in this life but of the healing kind, to destroy, not man, but sin, and preserve the sinner from eternal torments.*’ ‘ We know,’ says Flechier ; Bishop of Nismes, ‘ that faith may yield to persuasion ; but that it never will be controled.’ ‘ Remember,’ says Cardinal Camus, ‘ that the diseases of the soul are not to be cured by restraint and violence.’

If in after-ages some Popes and Bishops deviated from this plan of meekness and moderation, their conduct cannot justly involve any charge against the Church by which all coercive proceedings for religion’s sake are condemned. The truth however is, that persecution was seldom, if indeed ever, resorted to on account of mere speculative opinions on religion ; but on account of the seditious principles which so invariably accompanied heresy that sedition and heresy were considered as almost convertible terms. It was when religious innovators began to shake the pillars of the state and upset established governments, that the civil powers deemed it necessary for their own security, to adopt severe measures.

They were of Dr. Daubeny's opinion, 'that no rebellion ever began in the Church that did not end in the State,' and hence they concluded that, by repressing heresy, sedition would be nipped in the bud.

Much as Catholics regret that any of their clergy should ever have been in any way concerned in measures of cruelty; they nevertheless draw a clear line of distinction between the weakness or wickedness of the minister, and the sacredness of his ministry. Protestants are however in the habit of imputing all the atrocities and bloody executions, which unhappily took place, to the Catholic Church, instead of their true cause, the evil passions of men or policy of Governments. They charge religion with the guilt of actions in which it was no ways concerned, for example, the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, as if the conduct of the Calvinists had not been sufficient to excite royal resentment without the addition of bigotry. True to the detestable principles of their Master Calvin who maintained that, '*Princes forfeit their power when they oppose God in opposing the reformation; and that it is better in such cases to spit in their faces than to obey*'. (Comment, in Dan. v. 22,) the Huguenots rebelled against their prince, delivered up several of the principal cities of the kingdom to the enemies of their country, introduced foreign soldiers and spread murder, rapine, and devastation over the land. Surely such conduct is enough to explain the motives which led to the perpetration of this horrid deed without dragging religion into the question. There is so much misrepresentation and exaggeration respecting this shocking massacre that we think it will be satisfactory to our readers to receive the following correct account of it:—

The Massacre of the Calvinists at Paris on the 24th August 1572, commonly called The Massacre of Saint Bartholomew's has always been a fertile theme among the enemies of religion, assuming, that the Catholics were incited to the perpetration of this barbarity by religious zeal, they find no difficulty in condemning a system productive, by their account of such lamentable crimes.

But it is proved by incontestible authority, 1st, that religion was not the cause of this massacre, and that its ministers were in no way implicated in it. The King (Charles the IX.) did not require the additional motive of religious fanaticism to excite in him a hatred of the Calvinists who had rebelled against his authority, besieged his towns, introduced foreign troops into the kingdom, and had declared war against him on four different occasions, their defenders says, that their intentions were honest, and that they acted for the public good and for the welfare of their country, but this patriotic plea, which is very easily urged, will neither justify their revolt nor excuse the cruelty of their opponents.

The clergy were not consulted in this affair, nor were any of them present at the Council in which the massacre was resolved on. Even the Duke of Guise was excluded. It is wrongly asserted by the author of the '*Essais sur l'histoire generale*,' that the Cardinals Birague and de Retz were the contrivers of this design. They were at the time possessed of little influence, and were not raised to the cardinalate till many years afterwards. It is urged that Pope Gregory the XIII. offered up a solemn thanksgiving to God on the occasion, but this was not done to celebrate the murder of the Calvinists, but the preservation of the King of France, who had written to all the courts of Europe, that his life and his throne were in danger. It was very natural that the Pope should return thanks to the Almighty for the preservation of this monarch and of the Catholic Religion. If an enemy invaded our country and was repulsed and beaten with great slaughter we should doubtless return thanks to God, not for the effusion of blood but for our preservation from the threatened danger.

It is further proved even from the admissions of Protestant writers that in several towns where the people wished to follow the example of the metropolis all classes, of the clergy instead of aiding and abetting their murderous designs exerted themselves to the utmost to prevent such a catastrophe and sheltered numbers of the Calvinists in the convents and religious houses. This was done even at Nismes, where the Huguenots had twice massacred the Catholics in cold blood. Many Catholics also were involved in the fate of the Calvinists, so that the author of the *Annales Politiques* has every reason to maintain that the clergy took no part in this butchery.

2nd. The proscription of the Calvinists was dictated by false policy. The ambition of the admiral Coligny, his jealousy of the Guises, and his seditious conduct were the real causes of all the troubles of the kingdom. He was more a king with the Calvinists than Charles IX. was with the Catholics. The Huguenots had menaced the latter that if he did not make war on Spain they would force him to do so. Coligny had the temerity to offer him 10,000 men for the invasion of the low countries; a sufficient proof of the power at his command. This rebellious subject but too well deserved the sentence of proscription pronounced against him, but a general massacre of his adherents was not the way to punish his treason.

3rd. It is also proved, that the murder of Coligny and his party was not a deliberate and long-premeditated design but the sudden effect of the resentment of Catherine de Medicis and her son the Duke of Anjou, who imbued the King with the like revengeful feelings. The proscription had reference only to Paris and the leaders of the Huguenot party, but the passions of the people being once roused carried them far beyond the limits prescribed by the originators of this lamentable design. In several parts of the kingdom where the people acted against the express orders of the King the massacre was continued long after the memorable day, which gives a name to one of the most disgraceful events recorded in the annals of France. In Toulouse and Bordeaux it did not take place till a month afterwards. Yet the Calvinists and their partisans have had the hardihood to assert that the King sent orders to the different towns and provinces for the murder of the Huguenots, while the fact is, that he sent orders to prevent such a catastrophe.

The number of the sufferers is also much exaggerated. Some writers have estimated it at 100,000, others again maintain, that it did not exceed 10,000. The Protestant martyrology which gives 15,000, as the gross amount, says, that the number of the sufferers in Paris was 1,000, although in the detail only 468 are mentioned, and for the whole kingdom 786.

It is easy to perceive that this horrid affair was not directed against the common people but against the leaders of the Calvinists, men who were considered to be the causes of all the revolts, seditions, and crimes, that harassed the kingdom. It is then quite impossible that the number of those who suffered can be any thing equal to the amount stated by some of our modern writers.

The author of the work from which we have collected our information has been stigmatized as the apologist of this massacre, whereas his only object was to prove that the Protestant party have concealed the real cause of this sanguinary affair, and have cast the odium of it on men who were not at all concerned in it. It is rather an audacious attempt thus to calumniate a writer, who says, in the very commencement of his work, that 'if we subtract three-fourths of the horrible excesses committed on this occasion enough still remains to make it an object of detestation to every man alive to the feelings of humanity.'

It is said that the murder of the Calvinists was the united effect of the state proscription and of religious bigotry. There is no doubt of the proscription which of itself explains the cause of this catastrophe, but where are the proofs of the influence of religion on this occasion, — not a single one can be adduced. It is not quite certain, says one writer that Birague and de Retz were not of the council. If they had been there the Huguenots would not have been

massacred. He also says, that the humanity of many of the Catholics proves nothing. Surely then the humanity of the bishops, priests and monks does not prove them to be blood-thirsty zealots!

This writer has also vainly attempted to justify the conduct and designs of Coligny by the accounts given of him by the Protestant party; to crown the whole, he gravely assures us that the destruction of the towns of Merindol and Cabrieres, which happened twenty-seven years before, was the prelude to the massacre of St. Bartholomew's.

He tells us that, while Charles IX. sent couriers to stop the massacre in the provinces, he despatched secret emissaries to excite the Catholics to continue it—this is a pure unmitigated calumny.

In proof of the number of the sufferers he quotes accounts which have been repeatedly proved to be false and exaggerated.

On a careful examination of all the facts and circumstances of this cruel affair we do not see what advantage can be taken of it by the enemies of our religion.—*Translated from Dictionnaire Théologique.*

It thus appears that the clergy were not at all concerned in this deed of blood and perfidy except in saving the Huguenots. But it may be said that it was approved of by the Pope. On this point Dr. Milner observes as follows, in his letters to a Prebendary. 'If I were satisfied that Gregory the XIII. had approved of the foul deed of St. Bartholomew's day, after having viewed it in the same clear and steady light in which you and I behold it, now that the clouds of royal calumny, in which it was invested, have been dispersed, I should not even then think that persecution was proved to be a tenet of his faith, but I should judge him to have partaken of Charles and Catherine's Sanguinary disposition in opposition to the character which historians have stamped upon him. But you will recollect the infinite pains which the French King took, by letters, ambassadors, rejoicings, and medals, to make both his subjects and foreign princes, but most of all the Pope, believe that in killing the Huguenots he had only taken a necessary measure of self-defence to preserve his own life together with the constitution and religion of his kingdom. If we admit these accounts to have been believed at Rome and Madrid, as there is every reason to suppose they actually were, the rejoicings at these courts will put on a very different appearance from that in which you exhibit them.'

SCRIPTURE ALONE NOT A SUFFICIENT RULE OF FAITH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—The arguments you have from time to time adduced in proof of the insufficiency of Scripture, as a rule of faith, are certainly very plausible; but I have one doubt on the subject, and would wish it to be removed from my mind. I desire to know whether the doctrines of the Catholic Church furnish a complete and unquestionable authority in all matters of faith, (1°) and also, whether scripture is or is not in itself sufficient as a means of salvation; (2°) if not, whether the doctrines of the Catholic Church, independently of scripture, are so for that purpose. (3°)

10th September, 1839.

PUBLICUS.

NOTES BY THE EDITOR.

1°. For all matters of Faith, there is in the Catholic Church a complete

and an unquestionable authority, viz., the voice of the Catholic Church herself, who, having the whole word of God written and unwritten as her rule of faith, is guarded, in applying it, from error by the Holy Ghost, who, Jesus Christ has promised, shall be with her to the end of time.

2°. The scripture alone is not a sufficient means of salvation; because the scripture, unable of itself to prove its own authenticity and divine inspiration, or to explain whatever seems hard or doubtful in it, cannot afford that certitude which is requisite for divine faith. But *without faith it is impossible to please God*, and gain heaven; scripture therefore alone is not a sufficient means of salvation.

3°. The doctrines of the Catholic Church cannot, in the system of divine providence now established in her regard, be independent of scripture; because scripture, the written word of God, is one part of the rule of faith which God has given to her. However any of the Faithful, without reading the scripture, may know and believe, on the authority of the Church *who is the pillar and ground of truth*, all the revealed articles of faith which are necessary for salvation.—

ITEMS OF INTELLIGENCE.

(Translated for the Bengal Catholic Expositor, from *L'Univers* of the 7th March, 1839.)

A public convocation was held on the morning of the 21st February, when His Holiness invested the two recently appointed Cardinals Saglia and Tosti with the insignia of their present offices. On the conclusion of the ceremony, usual on such an occasion, all the cardinals attended at a chant of the *Te Deum* in the chapel contiguous to the consistory.

In a private convocation subsequently, His Holiness proposed the nomination of several Archbishops and Bishops, among others, we observe, to the archbishopric of Anazarbo, *in partibus infidelium*, the Right Reverend Romain Frederic Gallard, Coadjutor of His Grace the Archbishop of Rheims; and to the bishopric of Meaux the Vicar General of that diocese.

Owing to the zealous exertions of the Rev. Mr. Vanbaer of the parish of Saint Servais, the town of Maestricht is on the eve of enjoying the advantage of possessing a small community of Sisters, to be governed by the rules of St. Vincent de Paul. On the 28th February, three Nuns and three Novices, who compose the origin of the infant institution, pronounced in the hands of that worthy pastor, and in the presence of a numerous clergy, the vow of devoting themselves to the service of God and to the relief of their distressed fellow-creatures. The formation of this pious establishment has produced universal joy among the inhabitants of this town.

We extract the subjoined passage from a German paper relative to intelligence from Posnania:

'The Polish nobility of our province have already on divers occasions expressed their approbation of the line of conduct adopted by the clergy. We understand that the prelates of the chapter of Gnesna have been within the last few days the object of a demonstration of respect similar to that made to the Archbishop on the anniversary day of his feast. These prelates, and among them the two recently liberated, were invited to one of the late festivals of the nobility. The assembly used their utmost efforts to give them a brilliant reception, and to evince the veneration in which they were held, kissing their hands, and greeting them with enthusiastic acclamation.'

(From *L'Univers* of 14th March.)

The Right Reverend Mr. Smith, Bishop of Agna and Coadjutor of the Vicar Apostolic of the British Antillis, has just left Paris on his return to his mission. His object in coming to Europe was to recruit labourers of his sacred calling. It had pleased Providence to crown his zeal with success: upwards

of twenty missionaries, both from France and Ireland, proceed with him to take a part in the duties of his mission.

On the 16th of last month two new missionaries and a member of the fraternity of St. Lazarus embarked on the Ship *Adhemar* for China. The missionaries are Messrs. Evariste Regis Hue, of the diocese of Toulouse, and Vincent Privas, of the diocese of Lyons.

The Seminary of the Holy Ghost has sent, since the month of December, six priests to Guadaloupe, two to Bourbon, and two to Guiana.

(From *L'Univers* of 15th March.)

ROME.—His Holiness has conferred on Cardinal Lambruschini the dignity of Grand-prior of the Order of Jerusalem.

On the 23d February, Saturday of the Ember-week, a general ordination was performed in the Church of Latran by the Patriarch of Antioch, and the persons ordained on the occasion consisted of 14, who had the tonsure, 17 minors, 17 Sub-deacons, 24 Deacons, and 5 Priests.

FRANCE.—DIOCESE OF SAINT DIEZ.—The Reverend Joseph Claude Munier, Grand-vicar of St. Diez, Archdeacon and Superior of the grand seminary, died on the 4th March at the age of 71 years. On the occurrence of this melancholy event, the Bishop of St. Diez, addressed a circular to his clergy, eulogizing in strong terms the virtues and talents of that worthy coadjutor.

DIOCESE OF TULUS.—A mission was given from the 29th January to the 26th February, in the parish of Neuvié, diocese of Tulle, by two missionaries of St. Florer, and it proved quite successful, the number of persons who approached the Holy Table having exceeded three thousand.

DIOCESE OF AJACCIO.—The institution of the *Dames de la Miséricorde*, just established by Abbot Silves, already gives every indication of being attended with success. The most influential Ladies of Ajaccio have readily become members of this congregation. This charitable establishment can have but a salutary influence on the still rude character and manners of the inhabitants of this island.

Selections.

WESTMINSTER ABBEY—PROTESTANT AND CATHOLIC TOMBS.

Catholics built this great church for a great religion, that a whole people might go there to hear the word of God chanted with all the force of the human voice; that man might feel his own littleness in the temple of God, finding that the mighty song of assembled multitudes beneath its vaulted roof did not crack the edifice. Protestantism, by taking possession of Westminster Abbey, has straitened it for its own *religion de salons*, for its chants by women and children of the choir, for its sermons before a small auditory, for a handful of the faithful to which the minister reads prayers in a grave and sober voice, without accent, and without vibration. The nave of the old temple has been cut in half, and a boarded enclosure has been made with seats and benches for about a hundred of the faithful. The other half is empty; the consecrated soil begins at this wretched bit of carpenter's work, which has been built but to rot, while the walls, which generations raised for eternity, are neither revered nor profaned, unless by the rows of tombs which stand as an object of veneration for the traveller. Protestantism had not voice enough to fill these vast ailes, nor to ascend to these vaulted roofs; a mutilated edifice was necessary for a mutilated religion; less space was required for reason than for faith.

The struggle between two religions in the same church is not less plainly shown by the tombs of Westminster Abbey. Catholicism reared it, Catholicism stamps the greatest character on the tombs. I am not here speaking of art; there are more skilful strokes of the chisel in the monuments of Protestantism; in those of Catholicism there is little more than faith, often without art, but we feel a force in their workmanship, and a sort of certainty of another

life, which touches us profoundly. Those effigies of the Kings of the Norman race, all lying armed on the tombstones, all with joined hands, in the same attitude, all conceived according to one idea, though successive ages may have improved their execution; those women, those children, those faithful servants, who are ranged about the tomb, kneeling, their hands joined as those of the deceased, who mourn not, but pray, because tears pass away, not faith, and man can pray always rather than mourn; all these figures, who represent the drama of death, but do not play it, as in certain Protestant monuments—all this *naïveté* of an art, I say, the masters of which were but simple workmen, exercises a singular sway over the imagination and the heart. The design has been to make really dead persons; there is the very stiffness of a corpse in these limbs; nought is beating under this armour, these eyes are closed to open no more; the tomb is sealed, all is finished, but the artist has conveyed by these joined and heaven-lifted hands a thought—yes, the thought that possessed the deceased before he resigned his soul to God—the thought which inspired the artist himself, and often repaid him for his toils—the thought which filled the servants and the children of the deceased, the people who followed his obsequies, and the priest who sprinkled holy water on his relics—in a word, the thought that God may be disarmed by prayer.

In the tombs of Protestantism unity is gone. We find the diversity of a museum—busts, emblems, and statues. It is no more religious thought, but caprice and vanity, which gives the idea of a monument; it is art without faith which executes it. Prayer is no more considered; dramatic attitudes are given to the dead; some threaten, others smile upon you; one plays a part, and another expires with a grace. I have seen some mounting to heaven surrounded by clouds, and others haranguing Parliament. There is a noble lady who died, doubtless, much regretted by her husband; she is in her bed, expiring, while Death—that is to say, the great black skeleton with the sithe in its hand, which serves to frighten children—darts from a secret cavern under the bed of this poor lady. The husband perceives him; places himself between his wife and death, holds his suppliant hands to the latter, and entreats it with tears in his eyes. Now, translate all this:—*Lord Nightingale* was a good husband, or, at any rate, wished to pass as such. But who was *Lord Nightingale*? Why, a person who was rich enough to bury his wife at Westminster. This abbey is not confined to Kings and great men; it is a Pantheon, where every one pays for his place, and that dearer than at a cemetery. Shakespear occupies less space there than *Lady Nightingale*. George Canning and Pitt lie each under a slab with their name inscribed. Those whose mere name does not say enough are not in a position to be better known, or do not deserve it. Leave all this train of epithets and show of titles to those who have only made their life known by their death. A stone and a name is enough for celebrated men, since there is no longer a faith to lay them on their tombs, and to join their hands, and thus to show that their strength was only in prayer. The epitaph and monument should be left to history, and the deep impression which a grand biography concealed under a slab of six feet makes on the mind should not be stifled under works of masonry.

This profusion of tombs does not convey the idea of death. A grave newly dug, a coffin from which the pall has been removed the shovelfull of earth thrown upon it—these touch much more forcibly. Death, as a collective idea, only inspires declamations, and awakens no real sorrow. On the contrary, the nearer we are to the corpse, the more sad and impressive is this idea.—*Extracted and translated from Melanges par D. Nisard.*

LOCKE'S OPINION OF THE BIBLE AS A SCHOOL BOOK.

‘As for the Bible, which children are usually employed in to exercise and improve their talent in reading, I think the promiscuous reading of it, though by chapters as they lie in order, is so far from being of any advantage to children, either for the perfecting their reading, or principling their religion, that

perhaps a worse could not be found. For what pleasure or encouragement can it be to a child to exercise himself in reading those parts of a book where he understands nothing? And how little are the law of Moses, the Song of Solomon, the prophecies in the Old, and the Epistles and Apocalypse in the New Testament, suited to a child's capacity? And though the history of the Evangelists, and the Acts, have something easier, yet, taken altogether, it is very disproportionable to the understanding of childhood. I grant that the principles of religion are to be drawn from thence, and in the words of Scripture; but none shall be proposed to a child but such as are suited to a child's capacity and notions. But it is far from this to read through the whole Bible, and that for reading's sake. And what an odd jumble of thoughts must a child have in his head, if he have any at all, such as he should have, concerning religion, who, in his tender age, reads all the parts of the Bible indifferently as the Word of God, without any other distinction! I am apt to think that this, in some men, has been the very reason why they never had clear and distinct thoughts of it all their lifetime. And now I am by chance fallen on this subject, give me leave to say, that there are some parts of the Scripture which may be proper to be put into the hands of a child to engage him to read; such as are the story of Joseph and his brethren, of David and Goliath, of David and Jonathan, &c., and others, that he should be made to read for his instruction, as that, 'what you would others do unto you, do you the same unto them;' and such other easy and plain moral truths, which, being fitly chosen, might often be made use of both for reading and instruction together; and so often read till they are thoroughly fixed in the memory; and and then afterwards, as he grows ripe for them, may, in their turns, on fit occasions, be inculcated as the standing and sacred rules of his life and actions. But the reading of the whole Scripture indifferently, is what I think very inconvenient for children, till after having been made acquainted with the plainest, fundamental parts of it, they have got some kind of general view of what they ought principally to believe and practise; which yet, I think, they ought to receive in the very words of the Scripture, and not in such as men, prepossessed by systems and analogies, are apt, in this case, to make use of, and force upon them.'

MISCELLANEA.

BIGOTRY IN ABERDEEN.—A society was lately formed here for educating the children of the poor, a most praiseworthy object certainly. The plan was not to establish schools, but to supply free tickets of admission to such schools as the parents might choose; an equitable principle, as the funds were to be raised by voluntary subscription from persons of all religious denominations. Under the conviction that no sectarian distinctions were to be enforced, several Catholics became subscribers; but to the astonishment of every liberal and right-thinking mind, the directors of the society, after getting hold of the money, came to the resolution, 'that the education to be afforded by the society shall be restricted to Protestant schools!!' Much to his honour, the Rev. John Brown, of St. Paul's church, an episcopalian minister, opposed most strenuously the narrow-minded resolution, but he stood alone. The directors have already received their reward in the disgust expressed at their conduct by the liberal citizens, and the well-merited reproofs of the news paper press; and it may happen, that in this attempt to prevent the poor Catholic children of Aberdeen from obtaining the benefits of education, they are indirectly doing them a service, for an appeal has in consequence been made to the public in behalf of these poor children of Aberdeen, and a sum of about 130*l.* has already been subscribed. We have been requested, in the name of the Catholics of Aberdeen, to receive subscriptions to the fund for educating these children, and we doubt not there are many generous hearts who will respond to the call.

TWO LOAVES INSTEAD OF ONE.—Sir Charles Wolseley, Bart., has issued

the following piquant notice to the inhabitants of the parish of Colwich!—
 'Whereas, There appears to be a great lack of real charity in high places where it ought most to abound ; and those whose duty it is, in a special manner, to practise it, according to my humble opinion, do exactly the contrary ; and whereas the Catholic poor of the parish have not received one farthing, this last St. Thomas's day, of the usual distribution, and, moreover, it has been openly and publicly declared that those professing the Catholic faith (the 'ould' religion of your forefathers, remember,) are not entitled to any share of those charities ; and whereas there was, a very short time since, a no very equivocal inclination manifested even to persecute those of the Catholic religion, therefore, I, Charles Wolseley, do hereby declare, first, that I constitute and appoint the Rev. T. L. Green (the Catholic pastor of the parishes of Tixall, Colwich, and Rugeley) my Almoner, with means also of relieving to a certain extent the wants of the poor of my parish, in order to counteract, as much as lies in my power at least, the want of real charity so openly professed and acted upon as aforesaid, by putting into the hands of the said Rev. Mr. Green a certain field of six ACRES, which has been, for many years, let out to the cottagers for potato-ground. And I hereby direct that the Catholics, being deprived of the public charities of the parish, shall have, each, their plots rent-free ; and that those of any of the Protestant persuasions shall have, each, their plots at two thirds less than the usual rent demanded, that is to say, at four-pence per rood. I also hereby direct the said Rev. Mr. Green to pay to all the Catholics double the sum that they were used to receive on the St. Thomas's day, in better and more charitable times. And I further declare, that, if there shall be shewn hereafter the most trifling inclination to persecute, by threatening to turn out of their cottages those who may shew a disposition to become Catholics, on their making application to the said Mr. Green, they shall have houses found them at half the yearly rent they were before accustomed to pay, and shall be otherwise provided for according to my means. Given at Rome this fifth day of March, A. D. 1839, (signed) Charles Wolseley.—N. B. Sir Charles Wolseley wishes it to be further notified to those who receive their Sunday loaves, that if, in the event of their becoming Catholics, their loaves should be taken away, they shall have two loaves instead of one ; not by way of an inducement to turn, (as the terms sufficiently express ;) but that they shall not be persecuted.'

BAZAAR FOR THE TRAPPISTS.—A prospectus of a bazaar has just been issued to be held on the 28th and 29th of May inst., for the completion of the monastery belonging to the Trappist monks, established at Mount Saint Bernard, in Charnwood Forest, Leicestershire, under the most distinguished patronage. In the list of patronesses, we observe the Duchess of Leeds, the Marchioness of Wellesly, the Countess of Shrewsbury, Ann, Countess of Newburgh, Lady Mary Arundel, Ladies Stourton, Arundel, Bedingfeld, &c., &c.—*Catholic Magazine, for May 1839.*

INTELLIGENCE.

HAMMERSMITH.—The reformation Society have, during the present spring, been very active in this and the neighbouring locality of Kensington, in the expectation, no doubt, from the paucity of Catholics, of having everything their own way ; but, unfortunately for them, they have caught a Tartar, in the person of Daniel French, Esq., Barrister-at-law, between whom and the Rev. James Cumming, of the Scots Church, on the part of that society, a public disputation on the disputed points of Catholic doctrine has for some time been going on, in a large school-room at Hammersmith. To meet the misrepresentations of the itinerating agents of the reformation Society, Mr. French commenced a series of lectures, in the Windsor Castle Tavern, in explanation of Catholic tenets, with such effect as to stagger the belief of some of his Protestant auditors : this was gall and wormwood to some persons, who could not brook the idea of having their faith triumphantly impugned ;

and they therefore resolved to put Mr. French down by clamour and vociferation. They succeeded; but it is but justice to the great majority of the Protestants present to say, that they were utterly disgusted with the conduct of the small knot of brawlers. To counteract the effect of Mr. French's lectures, Mr. Cumming, unhappily for himself and his cause, stepped forward and challenged Mr. French to single combat; for we believe that he now, deeply laments that he provoked a discussion with an antagonist greatly his superior in learning, and in all the accomplishments of a debater. If we may trust to report, Mr. French will carry off several willing converts from the ranks of the Reformation, to grace and share in his triumph.

BARTON-UPON-IRWELL.—The teachers, scholars, and a few zealous supporters of the Sunday School, on Easter Sunday last, presented, through a deputation, the Rev. John Ball, their much-esteemed pastor, with a set of beautiful and splendid white satin vestments. An address was read on the occasion by the head of the deputation, to which the rev. gentleman made an excellent reply.

FLOWERS FROM THE HOLY FATHERS.

No. VI.

‘Dices forsan, grandis labor! sed respice quod promissum est.’—*Sti. Augustini Ep. 143, ad D:metr.*

Art thou afraid—does labour gall thee—
Affliction fray—penance appal thee;
Say, art thou all downcast—forlorn—
The yoke galls more than may be borne;
But hast thou listened to the voice
Of promise that ye shall rejoice?
Hast thou looked out beyond the grave;
Wouldst thou forget thy soul to save;
Wouldst thou prefer a passing ease
Before an everlasting peace?
Wouldst thou sleep on a little here,
And wake in quaking endless fear?
Say, wouldst thou live in sin awhile,
And batten on earth's fatal smile;
Taste of the chalice of its wrath—
O'erhung by flowers in sorrow's path;
Say, wouldst thou join the heavenly choir,
Or rather dwell in endless fire?
Oh, by the joys ye may inherit,
Restrain thy body—curb thy spirit;
Choose here the strait and narrow road,
That leads by penance to thy God;
Choose here the royal—only way,
That leads by toil to realms of day.
Let no delusive cowardice
Affray thy heart, or blind thine eyes;
His promises are rich and bright—
His yoke is sweet—his burthen light;
A little toil—a little pain—
God is thine all—and heaven thy gain!

Printed by Messrs. W. Rushton and Co., Calcutta, for the Proprietors,
price one rupee per month, or ten rupees per annum in advance. To non-
subscribers 8 annas per number.

THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

‘ One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.’

No. XIII.

SEPTEMBER 28, 1839.

VOL. I.

Discretion, which, as Falstaff says, is the better part of valour, is strongly infused into the character of the *Advocate*. Hence, whilst with false statements, garbled passages, and unfounded assertions, he continues virulently to attack the Catholic Church, he prudently abstains from making the least allusion either to the defence by which his charges have been refuted, or to the arguments wherewith we have shaken and overthrown the very foundations of his first great principle ‘the Bible-test.’ Perceiving with keen sagacity that to introduce our proofs into his pages might betray the weakness or falsehood of his assertions, he deems it better to leave our defence unnoticed—however dishonourable and unjust such a course may appear—than to run the risk of unsettling the faith of his beloved readers whose sanctity is taught to recoil at the very sight of the *Expositor*. But this is not the only point in which he displays his singular discretion. For having announced it to be his intention, as soon as he had made his general assault, to attack each article in order, he cautiously avoids the Gospel-test, which both in reason and by pledge ought to form his first subject, and of a sudden bursts on ‘Transubstantiation.’ The reason which he assigns for employing this skillful ‘*ruse de guerre*’ is a further proof of his admirable prudence. He chooses transubstantiation, he says, as his first subject, because it stands first in order in the Rev. G. S. FABER’s little book, which is the arsenal whence he means to supply himself with weapons. But the *Advocate* must not expect artfully to draw off and divert our attention from him to Mr. Faber’s mutilated extracts from the Fathers, which, though brief and easy work for him to copy, will take up more time and space to answer than we can at present afford. Besides, as the Rector of Long Newton, (for whom, either on account of his title or the name of his book ‘Facts and Assertion,’ the—*Advocate* feels a peculiar sympathy,) has already been completely refuted by the Rev. F. C. Husenbeth, we prefer to keep ourselves and our discreet opponent to the point in question, which in fact is the main hinge whereon the whole controversy turns.

Though the principle with which the *Advocate* started, viz. that the Bible privately interpreted is the only test of the soundness of any doctrine, has been proved to be impossible and absurd, yet the *Advocate* still continues to quote scripture by himself interpreted against us, as if his

principle were undisputed and irrefragable. But what right has he to assail our doctrine of Transubstantiation by citing texts of Scripture against it? We believe and prove it on the authority of the written as well as the unwritten word of God. If, as the *Advocate* pretends, it is the glorious privilege of a Christian to use the Scriptures as the touchstone of doctrine, it is a privilege which every Catholic has a right to enjoy as much as the *Advocate*. We claim our right. If then we have so much respect for Jesus Christ as against our senses to believe that, when he said, *my flesh is meat indeed and my blood is drink indeed*, he meant *that his flesh is meat indeed and his blood is drink indeed*, we are at a loss to discover, under what plea, or with what consistency, the *Advocate* can revile, insult and condemn our doctrine. Can he refuse us the high-prized Gospel-liberty, which he claims for himself because he pretends it to be the chartered privilege of all? Have we not the right to follow what we think to be the true meaning of Christ's words, as well as the *Advocate* has to adopt a contrary interpretation? Who has taught or empowered him *to spy into our liberty*, and infringe upon our rights? Who has commissioned him to force his meaning upon us in violation of our glorious Charta of Gospel-liberty? Yes, we understand the *Advocate*! He would give us liberty. But what kind of liberty? Why, the liberty to reject the clear, constant, universal interpretation of the Catholic Church, in order to submit with reverence and humility to the wild incoherent jarring notions of his own fancy. This after all is evidently the real butt—the aim of the *Advocate's* appeal. Like many a rebel impostor, who tries with the magic name of liberty to rouse the subjects of a lawful monarch to revolt, the *Advocate* would fain emancipate us from the mild and reasonable yoke of the church in order to make us the slaves of his own tyranny. While he so zealously calls us to the enjoyment of Gospel-liberty, he only in reality invites us to bend in submission to the scriptural interpretation which he is pleased to dictate.

Is he fallible then or infallible in the figurative meaning which he assigns to these words of our Saviour, '*This is my body—this is my blood*'? If he is fallible, his meaning may be wrong, and ours may be right. Is it not then the height of presumption in him to censure and revile our interpretation, supported as it is by the express words of Christ, by the force of the context, and by the venerable authority of the Catholic Church, because forsooth it accords not with his notion which is fallible and liable to error? But perhaps a light from above has burst upon the *Advocate* and disclosed to his mental vision the whole meaning of the Scriptures even to the secrets of the Apocalypse! Perhaps he is INFALLIBLE in his interpretation of the divine book! If this be so, we must of course, as soon as we are assured of it, listen to him with reverence and awe. But as the *Advocate* is conducted by Gentlemen who vary in their principles of religion, and one alone at most amongst them can be right, we should be glad to know which dark star in the *Advocate*-Constellation is invested with infallibility, that we may honour it above its less gifted satellites. Is it our Greek friend $\phi\lambda\omicron\beta\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ or Elia who by the mysterious names which they assume are perhaps '*the two witnesses spoken of in the Apocalypse*'? Is it the august personage, who with dignity sits in the editorial chair? If he can prove his title to infallibility, his great toe shall be kissed by us with warmer devotion than the Pope's, whose infallibility is no article of Catholic Faith. Though he treats us as if he enjoyed this great prerogative, yet he

cannot and dare not lay claim to it : not so much because it would be subversive of Gospel-liberty which he advocates, (for consistency with him is a matter of little moment :) but because his Protestant brethren would be as little inclined as Catholics to admit his claim. Asserting therefore as he does that each one has the right to use the Bible as his rule of faith, with what plea of justice does he violate this right in wantonly reviling our interpretation of the Bible ? What right, moreover, has he to adduce against us the authority of the Fathers whose authority he disclaims ? Our cry now with the *Advocate* is for Gospel-liberty, which must vanish the moment that the divine authority of tradition is acknowledged. If the *Advocate* will surrender the liberty-principle, and admit the authority of tradition, we pledge our word to answer all the obscure or disjointed texts, which, with the aid of Mr. Faber, he can extract from the Fathers. But until he do renounce his grand maxim of the Bible-test, he must indeed have an astonishing portion of that quality which is supposed to brazen in the forehead, if he flatters himself with the hope of engaging craftily our attention with a few extracts from the Fathers, whose authority, which he actually disclaims and disallows, would, the moment it is admitted, upset and destroy the very principle on which he stands.

It was our intention to reply to-day to our Greek-named opponent who has written upon the sufficiency of scripture as a rule of faith ; but our remarks on the *Advocate*, running to greater length than we expected, we will gratify φιλοβιβλος with a particular answer next Saturday. However he will admit that we have not lost sight of his subject which is the main point in dispute. For by the line of argument which we have pursued, it is evident, that we have not only swept aside all the *Advocate's* texts against Transubstantiation, but placed in stronger light the absurdity of the Bible being used by each one as a Test. Though the *Advocate* neither does nor can, without Catholic tradition which he denies, prove the divine inspiration of the Scriptures : though he can never show that his interpretation of them is infallibly the right one ; yet, granting for argument's sake, (what is too absurd for us in reality to grant) that the Bible ought to be each one's sole test of doctrine, we wish to know who has empowered him to come and test our doctrine with his Bible ; What right he has to violate the Gospel-charta of Liberty, which we certainly enjoy if HE does ; What plea he has to condemn our interpretation which may turn out to be better than his own. We wish further to know by whose authority he publishes anything in his paper even *in favour of his own religious notions*, or teaches his principles from the pulpit, or imbuces in schools the youthful mind with his conceptions ; since all this, if the Bible is each one's sole doctrinal rule and test, so far from being necessary or proper, is a gross violation of Gospel-liberty which secures to each one the right of judging for himself. The *Advocate*, consistently with his principle, ought to circulate the Bible (which in his opinion has the divine seal clearly stamped upon it) without ever once saying that it is the word of God, or once attempting to explain its meaning. If he do not relish this counsel, we will gratify his taste with the the advice, — to continue his tirades against the Catholic Church : to drop the name of the *Expositor* who refutes them : to leave unnoticed our proofs and our objections, lest, if they chance to meet the eye of his evangelical brethren, they may ruin his cause and character for ever.

We are happy to announce the arrival of the REVEREND MR. CHADWICK and his party, MESSRS. WELD, SCULLY, SHEA, and COOPER, on the *Plantagenet*, and we congratulate the Catholic Community on the effective aid which the College of ST. FRANCIS XAVIER has thus received.

The *Bas-Alpin* has published two letters written by M. L'Abbé Chastan, priest of the Diocese of Digne, now Apostolic Missionary in Corea, to which remote country he appears to have been led by a special vocation. His zeal has increased in proportion to the innumerable fatigues, difficulties and dangers, with which he has been surrounded. The following one is addressed to his parents:—

* *Corea, December 1837.*

'I had the honour of writing to you on the 31st of December last, from the frontiers of China, when about entering into Corea. We set out towards midnight: the first gate, which was most dreaded, we passed without difficulty. For my guides demanded of the soldiers on guard, whether it could be opened, and without waiting for an answer, we passed through an opening in the palisade at some distance, and large enough for ourselves and our horses. From this first gate to the second, about forty-five miles distant, not a single habitation was to be found. We managed to arrive in the evening at the first Corean town, where we should have been subjected to a terrible custom-house search. But when we were about nine miles from the city, we sent forward our horses, and we ourselves, under cover of a dark night, crossed the river Jalo, which was frozen, on the ice, leaving on our left the town and its dreadful custom-house, in which your poor James would have surely been seized if he had not managed to pass it in the manner he did. In this country, foreigners alone are looked upon as contraband. We lodged out of the town in a house that had been prepared for us. I arrived there worn out with fatigue, but very happy in having escaped from the jaws of the lion, and in finding myself in Corea, in spite of all the obstacles that were represented to us as insurmountable: for, I was told, that the first missionary who entered Corea, about fifty years ago, succeeded as it were by a miracle; for they had forgotten to shut the gate, and poor James passed the closed gates without miracle, I suppose, but with the special protection of Divine Providence. From thence to the capital, there was about thirteen days' march. My guides made me dress in mourning, habit, which consisted of a long gown of very coarse silk, a monk's hood which leaves only the eyes, nose and mouth open, a great cap in form of a bell, and over it a kind of silken fan which is held before the face. This sort of dress is the fashion of the country, and very convenient for concealing our figure, especially our beard, which would cause us to be suspected whenever we should appear in public. We arrived at the capital without any obstacle; it was a very sensible joy to myself and my dear brother Missionary who had preceded me, to find ourselves together at last after so much danger and painful anxiety.

In order not to expose him to danger, three-fourth of our Christians have retired into uninhabited mountains, where they clear those uncultivated lands, plant tobacco, rye, and all sorts of pulse. Some live, in summer, on the herbs which they gather on the mountains, and in winter, on the roots which they dig from the earth. Others, feed on acorns. Many there are who die through hunger. I have distributed among sixty families who were reduced to the brink of ruin, the little money I took with me: the crop is better this year than in any of the ten foregoing ones: we therefore hope that none will die this year through hunger. God will afterwards provide for us. I beg of you, my dear parents, not to be uneasy about the fate of James, I have never entertained a desire of returning to France, much less now, when I find myself at the end of my wishes. The Government either is, or feigns to be,

ignorant of our arrival, even to the present day. If we are taken, the greatest favor we have to hope for, is to be beheaded. When will this happen? When it shall please the goodness of God. I can neither promise myself a year, nor a month, nor a week of life or liberty; I have however this consolation, that our good God who has conducted us to this place in spite of so many obstacles, will still preserve us here some years for the sake of these new Christians.

(Sd.) J. H. CHASTAN.

CONVERSION OF THE KING OF PRUSSIA'S SISTER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—The following account, which I lately received from a friend, may I think be registered in the catalogue of the illustrious conversions to Catholicism that now-a-days astound Protestant Europe. I may add that I was fortunate enough to see Her Royal Highness after the heroic step she had taken.

Your's obediently,
TESTIS.

MY DEAR FRIEND,—In your last favour you imposed on me the task of writing out a circumstantial account of the conversion of the Duchess (then reigning) of Anhalt-Coethen. This conversion indeed among the many of notoriety and importance, which for the last twenty or thirty years, have astonished Germany, the cradle of Protestantism, undoubtedly holds a most conspicuous place. It cannot but prove highly interesting to those, who sincerely desire the accomplishment of that beautiful expression of Zachary 'to enlighten them that sit in darkness, and in the shadow of death, to direct our feet into the way of peace.' (Luke i. 79.) As consequently nothing can afford me greater pleasure, than a compliance with your present request, I send you a memorandum of those circumstances, which in the lapse of years have not escaped my memory relative to the above-mentioned conversion.

The Duchess of Anhalt-Coethen is one of the most illustrious personages in Germany, being sister to Frederic William III. King of Prussia, and sister-in-law to the Elector of Assia Cassel. She was born and bred in Prussia Proper, a country next to Saxony, the most inimical to the Catholic religion. I am not aware what circumstance served as a stimulus to the searching mind of the noble Lady to effect a reconciliation with the ancient faith. But this much is certain, that when she once entered the track of truth, she pursued her course with unremitting eagerness. A person of ordinary capacity, situated in her circumstances, would have shuddered at the consequences of a possible change of religious sentiments, and would have recoiled from the idea of making too free with 'wily Popery,' but the Duchess's mind was too noble, and too powerful, not to risk every worldly consideration for the acquisition of the inestimable pearl of eternal truth, wherever it was discoverable. Not the certainty of the displeasure of her royal brother, by-the-bye a most *intolerant* Protestant, not the censures, though vain, of her illustrious kindred, not the fear of her own subjects, who are nearly Protestants to a man, had the slightest influence on her mind, while employed in the search after truth. Her perusal of Catholic controversial and religious books was almost continual, and her interviews with pious and learned members of that religion as

frequent, as her circumstances would permit. It was of course by no means difficult to solve her doubts, and dispel that mist of blindfolding Protestant imposture, with which from her earliest years her mind had been imbued to the prejudice of the Catholic religion. Among other circumstances I remember that once on a grand court festival she even consulted a young Catholic student of civil law at Göttingen, Count de Reisach, who was one of the party, about certain questions regarding the Catholic religion and Canon law. The young Count, surprised how in the midst of worldly rejoicings the Protestant Duchess could be so solicitous about matters which he thought she either despised or ignored, made as good a reply as the festivities and his knowledge would allow. They separated, not to meet again but in Rome, after many years and under great changes, for the Duchess had become a Catholic, and the young Count had exchanged civil for canon law, and the little cap, short frock and three-coloured ribbon of the German student, for the three-cornered hat and long soutane of the Roman clergyman.* ‘What a metamorphose is this!’ exclaimed the Duchess, when they met on the delightful promenade of *Monte Pincio*, ‘how on earth have you managed to get on this attire? Do you recollect the joyous evening that I had the pleasure of seeing and consulting you? Thank God I am now a Catholic!’ ‘And I, may it please Your Grace,’ rejoined the Count, ‘I am now a Priest!’ Both united in heartfelt mutual congratulations on their change for the better.

After a serious and profound investigation into the truth of the Catholic religion, and after being firmly convinced of the necessity of embracing and publicly professing it, the Duchess embraced our faith together with her husband, the then reigning Duke of Anhalt-Coethen. The royal couple announced to their subjects and to the world at large the change in their religion; of the former none offered any opposition, but Her Highness’s brother, the present King of Prussia, behaved in a most virulent and unfeeling manner towards her. He sent his royal sister a sweeping philippic on her conscientious conduct, which was afterwards published, and created among sensible Germans of every persuasion much sensation, and disapprobation. But, by-the-bye, this was only a prelude to his recently forcing upon the Lutherans and other Protestants in his dominions, a new-fangled so called ‘Evangelical’ creed, to the formation of which though every sect has contributed, yet ‘Popery’ has, it seems, furnished the most. The above act was also but a prelude to his confining and declaring traitors Catholic Archbishops and Bishops, who are as loyal subjects as any in his kingdom. But what can *they* expect, after such tyrannical behaviour to *his own sister*?

After the demise of the Duke, which shortly afterwards took place, the Duchess repaired to Austria, where she now resides in great retirement, an example of apostolic zeal and Christian piety. Her influence with the late Emperor was very great. In the year 1830 she visited the ‘Eternal City’ on an important mission. To her unremitting activity the Catholics of Austria owe either the total repeal of many ridiculous laws, stamped with the ‘*esprit fort*’ of Joseph II., or at least the permission to leave them practically on the shelf. She was also the instrument of the re-establish-

* He was then Rector of Propaganda College, and has since been appointed Bishop of Eichstaedt in Bavaria.

ment of monastic institutions throughout Germany. I cannot conclude this meagre account, without subjoining that a brother of the present King of Prussia and of the Duchess, Prince Henry, renowned in the wars for liberty of 1813, now resides at Rome, a Catholic of primitive piety, and exemplary virtue, so that the nearest relations of the intolerant monarch profess the identical religion that he is endeavouring to crush.

I remain, my dear friend, your's ever,

— September, 1839.

* * * *

NO FAITH TO BE KEPT WITH HERETICS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—Permit me to offer some remarks on the disingenuous and shuffling conduct of the *Christian Advocate*, which I feel persuaded, no honest and unprejudiced man, whether Catholic or Protestant, can contemplate without feelings of disgust and indignation. From the commencement of his bigotted and intolerant career, he has studiously spoken of the Catholic Church in the most illiberal, severe and opprobrious terms, not only misrepresenting her doctrines but vilifying them by every expression of insult, bitterness, and derision. Unable to prove that his own system of religion rests on any better foundation than mere assumption, he goes on, week after week, calumniating and traducing the religion of the great majority of the Christian world. Whether he has discovered that such conduct is the key to popularity among those who seem to think it of infinitely greater importance to rail against the alleged abominations of Popery, than to investigate the truth of their own multifarious creeds, or that raising the No popery-howl in India is the most likely means of moving the bigotry of his supporters in England to extend the sphere of his usefulness in the vineyard, by augmenting his pecuniary resources, is a question on which I shall not presume to offer any opinion; but I have no hesitation in saying that a good cause cannot require the aid of such unworthy expedients as the *Advocate* resorts to. He repeats charges which have been again and again proved to be false and unfounded, as if they had never been refuted; he meanly recurs to objections which have been answered, and brings them forward with an air of triumph, as if they never had been even argued. In his last number, for instance, he has, (after a long string of inapplicable quotations from scripture, pretending to prove the unscripturalness of some points of Catholic doctrine; but which, in fact, only prove, that so long as he is himself the expounder of its true meaning, it will be easy for him to prove or to disprove whatsoever he pleases from the Bible) he has thought proper to revive the stale and antiquated charges of 'No faith to be kept with heretics,' and 'Deposing power of the Pope.' Now I assert most positively that these charges are utterly false. 'It is untrue,' says Bishop Bains, in his letters to the Archdeacon of Bath, 'that it is, or ever was, the doctrine of the Catholic Church that 'faith might not be kept with heretics. It is untrue that that the Catholic Church ever refused to repeal the decree which establishes this doctrine, for no such decree ever existed. It is untrue that this doctrine stands as a decree of authority in the words of Innocent the Third, and if it did you ought as a divine to know, that it could not consistently with the doctrine of the Catholic Church, lawfully be received or obeyed. It is untrue, that infallibility in the

Pope is an article of Catholic doctrine ; and it is worse than untrue that either the good of the Church, or the commands of the Pope, or any other consideration whatever, could, by the doctrines of the Catholic Church, justify any Catholic in the slightest deviation from moral, religious, or civil duty.'

The learned prelate then adduces the authentic decisions of six Catholic Universities, situated in different parts of Europe, obtained by Mr. Pitt, for the satisfaction of the British Government, all of which indignantly disclaim the odious imputation ' that faith is not to be kept with heretics,' a doctrine which has, as well as the deposing doctrine, been solemnly abjured in the Oath of Allegiance taken by Catholics. '*I do swear that I do reject and detest that unchristian and impious principle that no faith is to be kept with heretics*'—'*I further declare that it is not an article of my faith, and I do renounce, reject, and abjure the opinion, that Princes excommunicated by the Pope and council, or any authority of the See of Rome, or any authority whatsoever may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any person whatsoever.*'

When the Catholic question was discussed in 1810 some mention was made of these doctrines, upon which the late Lord Liverpool the great opponent of the Catholic claims observed :—

'I have heard allusions made this night to doctrines which I do hope no man now believes the Catholics to entertain ; nor is there any ground for an opinion that the question is opposed under any such pretence.'

With reference to the decree of the Council of Constance, which concerned Huss, Dr. Bains remarks in reply to Dr. Moysey and Vindex :—

'But had the decree passed by the council, actually taught the odious and infamous doctrine Vindex asserts, still it could not have constituted an *article of Catholic faith*, nor consequently have bound the inward assent of any Catholic. First, because no decree of a general council is ever admitted as an *article of faith*, unless it be proposed as such to the whole church. Now this decree was never proposed to the church at all, nor was it even ratified by the Pope who presided at the council, but was a mere assertion of right, made on a particular occasion, and applicable only under particular circumstances. Secondly, nothing can be considered as an *article of Catholic faith*, unless it is received as such by the great body of Catholic Bishops. Now so far from the decree in question having ever been received by the great body of Catholic Bishops as an article of faith, I defy Dr. Moysey or any other man with a name to produce one single instance of a Catholic Bishop receiving it as such ; or deducing from it the odious doctrine asserted by Vindex.'

'The third Council of Lateran,' says Husenbeth in his reply to Faber :—

'Expressly mentions in its 27th Canon which is the one here alluded to, the concurrence of the Civil and ecclesiastical powers to condemn and punish the shameful Catheri and others whose principles were infamous, anti-civil and anti-social to a degree which called for the interference of the spiritual power to excommunicate, and the temporal to exterminate. There is no question here of persecution for mere opinions of religion. As to the eternally misrepresented 3d Canon of the 4th Lateran. 1st It was never accepted by the Church, and therefore could be no Canon of the Council. 2dly. If it were even authentic, it would be merely an act of temporal legislation as to its penalties, decreed by the concurrence of the civil power ! and therefore, 3dly. Since every one of the temporal states withdrew their concurrence in the temporal legislation of that Canon, it has become absolutely null. 4thly. It is after all an interpolation. Dr. Milner observes of the heretics condemned by the Canon, that 'their principles were of so impious, so perfidious, and so infamous a nature, and above all so destructive of the human species, that a

Pagan Government would have betrayed its duty which neglected to extirpate such abominations with fire and sword.

'Admitting' says, Dr. Milner as I have explicitly and repeatedly done, both in my history and in the present letter, that Pontiffs, like other men, were liable to the self-love and passions of human nature, it would be a greater miracle than any recorded in holy writ, if some of them had not abused both their spiritual supremacy, and their temporal principality, to the gratification of their ambition and avarice. Some abuses of this nature I have recorded, not in terms of approbation, as you suppose I was bound to do, but of strong censure, and I have shown, that they were resisted and condemned by the princes, prelates, and writers of those times, no less than they are at present. I could add, sir, a long list of cotemporary Saints, and of other most revered characters, who proved by their conduct that they knew how, as I have elsewhere said, to acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of the Pope, without ascribing to him an atom of temporal authority or property in this or in the other kingdoms of Europe; more than their respective legislatures condescended to give him. I could adduce many acts of the sovereign and the legislature at home, to restrain the encroachments of the Roman court, without any impeachment or suspicion of their orthodoxy, by way of shewing that this nation was not heretofore in such an abject state of dependence on the former, as you and most modern writers so invidiously describe it to have been; and I could call to your memory the example of many zealous children of the Pope abroad, besides the Emperor Charles V., who have not scrupled to take up arms against his temporal power, and *whilst they kissed his feet to tie his hands*, in order to restrain that power within its due limits.

'If the public vices of some Popes, particularly their ambition and injustice, have not deprived them of their spiritual authority, or the church of the benefits of the execution of this authority, so neither have the private vices of certain others produced these effects. Had not Catholic writers acknowledged and recorded the crimes of these wicked Pontiffs, particularly those of the tenth century, you could never have come to the knowledge of them.

'It is true,' says the same author, 'that the Pope did issue a decree (against Elizabeth) pretty nearly of the tenor which you have described. But the grand question recurs, how far this affected the allegiance of English Catholics? Did they receive the sentence of deposition against their sovereign? Did they act up to the letter and spirit of it? The fact is, only one person in their whole number, John Felton, a lay gentleman, who affixed it to the door of the Bishop of London's house, is known to have approved of it, for which act he died, condemned by the whole Catholic body no less than by Protestants.'—*Letters to a Preb.*

'No one can doubt,' says Husenbeth, on the same subject, 'the Pope's right to excommunicate; but to depose, and to absolve from allegiance are rights which the Catholics knew better than to acknowledge in His Holiness. That part of the bull was never regarded; nor indeed did the Pope ever publish his bull to the English, or require their observance of it. It was considered an unwarrantable assumption on his part.'—*Reply to Faber.*

On this subject I have only one more quotation to offer, which is from an official communication from POPE PIUS THE SIXTH, to the Bishops of Ireland, solemnly disclaiming on the part of the Catholic Church the odious doctrine which the *Advocate* continues to impute to Catholics in the teeth of their most solemn abjuration of it upon oath. '*The See of Rome*,' says His Holiness, '*never taught that faith is not to be kept with the heterodox; that an oath to Kings separated from Catholic Communion can be violated; that it is lawful for the Bishop of Rome to invade their temporal rights and dominions. We too consider an attempt or design against the life of Kings or Princes, even under the pretext of religion, as a*

horrid and detestable crime.' See the whole letter in the Ap. to the Report of the Committee of the House of Commons on the laws and ordinances in foreign states respecting Roman Catholic subjects, page 427.

In conclusion, Sir, I appeal to every candid and dispassionate mind whether the *Advocate* has not been clearly convicted of gross calumny. And when it is borne in mind that the false charges he has advanced were solemnly denied in the declaration of the British Catholic Bishops lately republished by you, it seems hardly possible not to ascribe his conduct to something worse than ignorance. He seems, to belong to that respectable class of Anti-popery writers whom the celebrated Protestant Professor Zanchius describes in the following terms :—

'I am indignant,' exclaims this candid Protestant, 'when I consider the manner in which most of us defend our cause. The true state of the question we often on set purpose involve in darkness that it may not be understood : We have the impudence to deny things the most evident : we assert what is visibly false : the most impious doctrines we force on the people as the first principles of faith, and orthodox opinions we condemn as heretical : We torture the scriptures till they agree with our own fancies ; and boast of being the disciples of the fathers, while we refuse to follow their doctrine : to deceive, to calumniate, to abuse is our familiar practice : nor do we care for any thing provided we can defend our cause, good or bad, right or wrong. O what times ! what manners !'—Zan. ad Stormium, tom. viii. Cal. 828.

Q.

Selections.

THE ALLIANCE BETWEEN POPERY AND HEATHENISM.

Letter IV.—Dr. Wiseman to Mr. Poynder.

SIR,—The specimens of your inaccuracies given in my last letter, will be sufficient, I flatter myself, to put you and your readers on their guard against too implicitly believing often-repeated tales. I will trouble you only with a few more reflections, and they shall be moreover very brief.

Throughout your work, you assume it for granted, that there is a system of premeditated deceit carried on by the priesthood unto which I belong ; that there is amongst us a desire and a constant effort to keep the people under subjection, by the invention of miracles or of dogmas, of ceremonies or of commandments, just as our ends or our circumstances may best appear to require. Were this true, we should, of course, deserve that society and mankind should scout us from the face of the earth. To me further information on this important point would be highly interesting. For if any one has a right to claim initiation into all the mysteries of his caste, I think I have every reason to suppose that I ought to have been made a craft-master in mine. Having received most of my education in the very heart and citadel of its influence ; having been deemed sufficiently qualified to prepare others for this dark ministration, and to instruct them in all the arts they must exercise ; having been honoured, however unworthily, with several commissions implying a confidence in my staunchness and fidelity,—I should imagine I am entrusted with the whole secret of our power, and all the happy resources which you attribute to us, for preserving and extending our spiritual dominion. I cannot therefore but think it strange, that you should know so much more about our principles and doings, than has ever been intrusted to me, or that I have been desired to teach to others of the same profession. For the way, and the only way, in which I, or those who have learnt with me, were taught by our good and learned masters to gain and keep our influence over men, was by outstripping them in good works, and endeavouring to show forth, in practice, the doc-

trines which we inculcate, by ever living up to the obligations we have taken upon ourselves, and by never being slack in the duties of our ministry.

As to miracles, it is true we were taught to believe in them ; and if we therein resemble heathens, you might have made your parallel still more complete, for we believe them precisely for the same reason which they assign :

Οἷων τελεσάντων

οὐδέν ποτε φαίνεται εἶμμεν ἀπίστον.*

We believe, like them, in the omnipotence of God, and see no authority for supposing that his arm is shortened. I know not whether your admiration of Middleton carries you to the extent of admitting the principles of his *Free Enquiry* ; if so, you of course maintain that the only way to get rid of Catholic miracles is, to consign all the fathers of the Church to the same doom, of being considered impostors and forgers of wonders, to deceive the people. If so, I once more thank you for the good company in which your reasoning compels you to place us. If you excuse them, at the expense of your master, you overthrow the whole foundation of your argument, by allowing miracles to have continued in the Church after the apostles' times ; and I should be glad to know whence came the decree, and where it is to be found, which put an end to the interference of God's power in his own works.

But while we are thus taught to believe in miracles generally, somehow or other we have been always told to be very much upon our guard against admitting any case, without the minutest examination ; and I have ever observed the extremest caution used by persons in high office, about such as were reported ; and I have known instances of spurious or imaginary ones being most severely exposed and condemned, in the most public manner. You know as well as I do, that no Catholic is bound to believe any of the miracles you record, and I dare say you will find many who disbelieve them all. In fact, I think Catholics are quite as hard to convince of the truth of any miracle as Protestants, and yet they remain good Catholics. For my part, all my reflection and study have led me to doubt the truth of that principle which Voltaire adopted from a heathen philosopher, that incredulity is the beginning of wisdom. I have never observed in those persons, who, so soon as they hear of any extraordinary manifestations of God's power, take their untruth for granted till they be fully proved, any other demonstrations of a strong mind, or nervous reason. On the contrary, I have generally noted, that those who scoff at such things, and make a boast that they are not easily convinced, are in fact only endeavouring to shroud ignorance and weakness behind this small display of unbelief, and desirous to gain the character of an *esprit fort*, with the slightest possible risk. I am not ashamed to own, that believing, as I do, in the promises to faith and prayer not having been withdrawn or weakened, and in God's exercise of his power, when required in favour or in honour of his Church ; when I hear from persons whose characters I fully know, and who, I am satisfied, could have no motive or desire to deceive me, of some such work of power, whereby the goodness of God has been displayed in favour of those who trusted in him, and where the worst consequences of a mistake could only be my having blessed Him for his care of those who love Him, and having felt a passing glow of virtuous feeling through my soul ; my first impulse is to believe and to receive such a recital ; and neither building faith nor resting proofs upon it, I preserve it as a seed of hope, till something more occurs, either to give it further life, or to wither it where it hath been cast. And as when we throw into the garden's soil many seeds together, we are contented if but a few spring up and yield us fruit ; so am I, if, of many such facts, some are more fully verified, and ripen into proof ; whereas, if I rejected all, I probably should have the joy of none. And if you would read the beautiful preface of the philosophical Görres to the exquisite life of Klaus von der

* Pindar, *pyth.* x. 77.

Flüe, written by his good and amiable son, you would see how rational and how reasonable is the course which I pursue.

But among all your declamations against the Catholic priesthood, there is one, the wickedness of which recoils, in my idea, so signally upon yourself,—one which I can with such difficulty believe could have been uttered by any one whose mind habitually loved to dwell on the holy and the good,—that I cannot believe any sincere friend of your religion will help abhorring any defence of it which could require such blasphemous expressions. I allude to the indecent way in which you speak of the adoration paid by us to the Blessed Eucharist, where we believe the true body and blood of our Redeemer to be present. (p. 66.) You may differ from us in belief, but only infidels have in general ventured to scoff and rail at any worship which is intended for the true God and his adorable Son. If a Socinian, disbelieving in the incarnation, were to speak as you do of our Lord, when a helpless infant in the flesh, or were he to say, in parallel language, that no people ever thought of their God being put to death, before the Christians, you would not think his difference of belief would justify him in such unseemly levity. The same is your case ; for the belief of Christ's presence in the Eucharist is that not only of Catholics, among whom have assuredly been in our times, and are, men of the soundest philosophical minds, but of the Lutherans, and of the most learned divines of the Anglican Church.

You do not believe yourself, or the sect, whatever it may be, to which you belong, possessed of infallibility ; and therefore you may be wrong in what you now hold, even according to your own principles. You should not, consequently, rail at what you, one day, may discover to be true. And even, if this grace never should be granted you, if you should feel yourself immovable in every article of your present creed, I would exhort you to remember, that even the archangel Michael, when contending with the evil one, 'Durst not bring against him a railing accusation,' as your version renders it, or as the vulgate more strongly and literally words it, 'a judgment of blasphemy.' (Jude, 9.) There is a taint and a leprous defilement left on the soul of him who uses words of blasphemy, however right the hypothesis on which he grounds them ; there is an unchasteness of mind, in the indulging of thoughts even regarding error, which, if spoken of the truth, would be insulting to God's awful majesty ; and, therefore, would not an archangel defile himself by the use of such rebuke, even to the accursed fiend. But to his conduct, the apostle opposes those who 'speak evil,' (or, as the vulgate renders it once more, 'who blaspheme those things which they know not.' (v. 10.) Take heed which of these courses you follow ; and learn, first, to make yourself acquainted with the subjects you handle, before indulging in unchristian language ;—nay, even then refrain from using it.

I must now draw these letters to a conclusion, not from want of matter, or from a desire to pass over several other topics of your book ; but because, I trust, I have done sufficient in the two first to overthrow the entire groundwork of your theory ; and in the two last, to prove what credit is due to your specific assertions. Things which appear strange, or even wrong, to the uninitiated, are beautiful when their true origin and meaning are understood ; or, as the divine poet beautifully expresses it,—

‘ Veramente più volte appajon cose
Che danno a dubitar falsa materia,
Per la vere cagion che son nascose,’

Purgat. xxii.

and I shall be satisfied, if this correspondence shall lead any of its readers to further enquiries, regarding the character of our ceremonies, as well as of our dogmas.

I am, &c.

PROTESTANTISM CALMLY CONSIDERED.

What is this Protestantism, about which so much noise is made? This Protestantism which is considered to be so much in danger, that its friends are obliged to prostitute the press, to misrepresentation and slander, in its defence? In every department of society our eyes are disgusted with publications purporting to be a defence of Protestantism, and teeming with the abuse of Popery and Papists. The cottages of the poor, which ought to be the abodes of peace and good will, become the receptacles of religious animosity, and are filled with suspicion, and even *hatred* of others, by the poisonous influence of loathsome tracts, which are daily issuing from the press. Like other vermin they shun the light, and prefer to crawl their hateful way in secrecy and darkness; aided sometimes by well-meaning but mistaken men, at others by canting fanatics, who can prove every thing from the Holy Scriptures, except that they ought not to lie, nor speak ill of their neighbours. What then is this Protestantism? It is not a term designating any particular sect, but a name given to all who have deserted or are excluded from the Catholic Church; it is a coat that fits every back, a receptacle for men of the most opposite belief and opinions, as well as for those who have no religious opinions at all. There is no test by which the faith of a Protestant can be tried, *as there is no creed to which he is bound*; you may believe that God has predestinated *you* to a state of felicity, and *your neighbours* irretrievably to eternal torments, and yet be a good Protestant. One believes that Christ at his last supper gave his real body, another believes that he gave nothing but a piece of bread—*they are both Protestants*. Some believe that baptism is necessary for children, others that it is only necessary for adults, and others who are still more liberal, that it is necessary for neither one nor the other! One pays divine worship to God the Son; another calls it idolatry, by making more Gods than one. One says we are obliged to believe all that Christ has taught, another says we may believe as much of it as we please, provided our lives be moral and honest, since God is too good to condemn any one for a mistaken belief; yet they are all Protestants and all prove their faith from the Bible! Can this be the divine system which the Son of God came down upon earth to establish? *Is it a religion, a holy church; or a Babel of confusion?* Would it not be better if those who are enlisting the whole world in the circulation of Bibles, and tracts, would take the trouble to make the people acquainted with what the Bible contains.

Protestantism, as applied to the Church of England, CANNOT BE THE TRUE RELIGION, BECAUSE IT WAS NOT FOUNDED BY CHRIST; the religion of JESUS CHRIST had subsisted 1500 years before Protestantism was heard of. It cannot be the true religion, *because it was founded by bad men, and for bad purposes*: all the first disciples of the Reformation embarked in the concern either through *pride or lust*; KING HENRY THE EIGHTH left his religion because it would not allow him to put away his wife; LUTHER, its founder, was originally a Catholic priest, and abandoned his religion because he was too haughty to submit to its reprehensions; after he turned reformer and set himself to preach against fasting and doing penances, *he became a complete monster of pride and brutality*. We have his own words for it, which every person may read who will take the trouble of consulting his works. 'I am burnt,' he says, 'with the flames of lust. I am almost mad with the rage of lust and the desire of women. I who ought to be fervent in spirit, am fervent in impurity, in sloth, &c. Relying on the strong foundation of my learning, I yield not in pride, either to emperor, king, prince, or devil.'—(Resp. ad Maled. Reg. Aug.)—Such is the real character of the man whom Protestants are taught to consider as a saint, and as one appointed by God to reform religion! That the other reformers followed his example I will prove from the testimony of ERASMUS, who observed with his own eyes, 'And who,' he says, 'are these gospel people? Look around you and shew me one who has become a better man. Shew me one who once a glutton is now turned sober; one who before violent, is now meek; one who before, avaricious, is now generous; one who before impure, is now chaste. I can

point out multitudes who are become far worse than they were before. Their discourses are little else than calumnies against the priesthood. They have abolished confession, and few of them confess their sins even to God. They have abrogated fasting, and they wallow in sensuality. St. Paul commanded the first Christians to shun the society of the wicked, and behold, the reformers seek most the society of the most corrupted !

At the present day, we never hear of a Catholic turning to Protestantism, through a desire of living a stricter life ; if ever he leaves his religion, it is because his religion is too strict for him, and he shakes it off, *that he may live as he pleases* ; but when death comes, he is generally glad to return to it again. Death is the time for trying people's sincerity ; *and the number of Protestants who wish to have a Catholic priest, at that awful time, abundantly proves, that if the Protestant religion is the easiest to live in, the Catholic religion is the safest to die in.* It has been acknowledged by Protestant ministers, that when they attended the sick, they have often found them in trouble about their faith ; and that the first and chief thing to be done, was to quiet their doubts on that head. When Catholics are upon their death-bed, their case is very different ; about the truth of their religion they are perfectly satisfied ; the only thing which gives them trouble is, that they have not taken more pains to live up to its maxims.

Protestantism cannot be the true religion, because its ministers are self-appointed, and have received no commission from God to preach, or perform any spiritual function. When Christ appointed his apostles to the work of the ministry he said to them, '*As my Father hath sent me I also send you : receive ye the Holy Ghost,*' &c. (John, chap. xx.) Accordingly as St. Paul testifies, '*No man taketh the honour to himself, but he that is called by God as Aaron was.*' This divine commission, comprehending all the powers necessary for the work of the ministry, descends to the Catholic Clergy in virtue of their ordination by bishops rightly ordained, and succeeding in right line to the Apostles. But have Protestants received any such commission ? If they have, when, and from whom did they receive it ? Who ordained their ministers ? Their bishops. *And who ordained their bishops ? NOBODY.* Their first bishops had no valid ordination. It is therefore plain that *THEIR PRESENT BISHOPS HAVE NO OTHER POWERS THAN WHAT THE STATE GIVES THEM ; AND IF THE KING AND PARLIAMENT WERE SO TO DECREE IT THEY WOULD HAVE TO SURRENDER THEIR LIVINGS AND THEIR CHURCHES into the hands of the Methodists, Unitarians, or ANY OTHER SECT.*

Protestantism cannot be the true religion, because it allows men *to embrace whatever faith they like best*, or find most convenient ; contrary to common sense, which teaches, that since Christ came upon earth to establish one, and only one religion it is our duty to find out which is that one true religion—which he established ; *contrary also to the words of Christ*, who commanded his apostles to teach just those things which he had taught them ; and declared that whoever would not believe them should be damned, (Matt. xxvi. Mark xvi.) ; also to the words of St. Paul, who tells us that if even an angel were to come down from heaven and teach us a different doctrine from what we have received, we must not listen to him, (Galat. i. 8.)

Protestantism cannot be the true religion, because it is both inconsistent and unholy. It teaches that all men have a right to choose their own faith, yet is continually upbraiding Catholics for believing what they think right. It teaches that the Catholic religion is a mass of superstition and idolatry, yet allows that Catholics can be saved if they only live up to what they profess. It ridicules Catholics for fasting and doing penance, yet enjoins fasting to its own members, (see the Book of Common Prayer.)

'It teaches that Christ has given to no man upon earth power to absolve sinners ; yet in the visitation of the sick, it requires the sick person to make a special confession of his sins, after which the minister is enjoined to exercise the power (which he has never received) of binding and loosing, in this manner : *I absolve thee from all thy sins in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of Holy Ghost.*

'It allows the rich to put away a lawful wife and marry another ! (see the

Report of the Speeches of the Bishops, at the Trial of the late QUEEN CAROLINE and the every-day occurrences in high life.) It teaches people to pronounce a falsehood of the most awful kind, every time they repeat that part of the creed, *I believe the holy Catholic Church*. It affords the edifying spectacle of a clergy inculcating to others what they do not believe themselves; for example, the Athanasian Creed forms part of the public service, which they are enjoined to recite on stated occasions; yet how few of the Protestant clergy subscribe to it in their hearts! Even the thirty-nine articles, which form the basis of their religion, are not believed by one in a hundred of the clergy of the present day; yet they are obliged to declare their assent to the truth of them in the most solemn manner! Thus is liberty given to the people to believe that a man may solemnly attest that he really and unfeignedly believes what he really and unfeignedly disbelieves! One of the fruits of the reformation in England is, *that men take oaths like they drink water*.

If this be a religion which can satisfy the consciences of Protestants, they may possess it in peace: Catholics have no wish to molest them; they are content to go to heaven by a road of greater constraint, but more certainty. They glory in having stuck true to the faith of their forefathers; and in knowing that their religion is not, like the Church of England, confined to one nation, but fulfils in itself the prophecies of Scripture, by being the church of all nations, as it is of all ages. They have too much confidence in the promises of Christ, to think that it will ever be shaken by the malice of those who have separated from its pale; and can view in security their puny efforts to defame it by distributing tracts filled with lies and perversions of Scripture. The Catholic Clergy have generally too much *contempt for such trash to think it worth their notice*—OR TOO MUCH OF MORE IMPORTANT BUSINESS upon their hands to find time to answer it. They trust to the force of truth and persuasion FOR SUCCESS; and they think it no small compliment to the merits of THEIR CAUSE, when its enemies are obliged to take secret and shabby means of opposing it.

If it is to be opposed let it be by preaching and public disputation, not by deceiving the people with the misrepresentation and falsehood contained in tracts prophanelly called religious. *But it is all in vain; they are only the efforts of men in despair*. THE CATHOLIC RELIGION IS AGAIN SPREADING ITSELF OVER THE FACE OF THE LAND. IT HAS BEEN KEPT DOWN BY A SERIES OF INTOLERANT LAWS, AND ALMOST EXTINGUISHED BY THE BLOODY PERSECUTIONS OF PROTESTANT KINGS: *but it is again taking its hereditary attitude*, supported by Him who promised that the *gates of hell shall not prevail against it*. If there be any who think it teaches those absurdities which are imputed to it by its enemies, let them take the proper means of informing themselves, (and nothing can be of so much importance as to find out which is the true religion) *let them attend Catholic sermons and instructions, and judge for themselves: let them consult the first Catholic Priest they can find, and let them ask him whether those things be so?* whether, for instance, an indulgence is 'leave to commit sin?' whether he teaches people to 'worship the saints?' or that no faith is to be kept with heretics? They may rely upon it they will find the Catholic religion to be very different from what they have been taught to suppose it. They will find that it teaches nothing but what is most holy—nothing but what is shewn to agree most strictly with the words of Scripture—nothing but what has been taught and believed, in all former ages, since the beginning of Christianity.

'To hear both sides of the question, and seek information from those who are qualified to give it, is the rational way of proceeding in a case of such consequence; but how foolish and disgraceful it is for men who boast of a spirit of 'free enquiry,' and who in temporal matters act with the greatest circumspection, to act with less caution in matters of religion, and to suffer themselves to be gulled by those who have an INTEREST IN DECEIVING THEM, and keeping them in the dark!

BIRMINGHAM.—A magnificent church is to be immediately commenced in Bath Street, from the designs of Mr. Pugin. It is to be 150 feet in length by 60 feet in the transept, and 53 feet in the nave, with a grand high altar, a Lady's chapel, and a beautifully ornamented interior. A sum of about 5,000*l.* has been already subscribed towards this undertaking, including a splendid donation of 1,000*l.* from the Earl of Shrewsbury, 2,000*l.* from the Rev. Dr. Walsh, 700*l.* each from two anonymous 'friends,' 250*l.* from Mr. Hardman, sen., and 50*l.* from Mr. Hardman, jun.

FLOWERS FROM THE HOLY EATHERS.

No. VII.

'Crux tua, bone Jesu, omnium fons benedictionum, omnium gratiarum causa, per quam credentibus datur virtus de infortitate, gloria de opprobrio, vita de morte.'—*Sti. Leonis. Pass. Ser. 8 de Passione.*

Hail to thy holy Cross, sweet Jesus;
Hail to the loved and saving Sign,
From whence all healing comes to ease us—
Whence virtue flows, and might divine.

Hail to the Cross, fount of all blessings,
Whence grace descends in copious flood,
Worthy alone of all caressings—
Hail to thee, loved and saving wood!

Hail to the holy Cross, that giveth
Virtue and strength, and loving faith;
Hail to the Cross that ever liveth,
Singing Life's triumph over Death!

Hail to the Cross, from whence went raying
Athwart o'er earth Love's holy flame!
Thy banner o'er its heights displaying,
And reaping glory from its shame!

Hail to the holy Cross—rejected,
Albeit and scorned by worldly pride;
Yet by Almighty love elected
To be the meek and humble's guide.

Hail to the holy Cross—affliction
Sinks not the heart, nor bids it quail,
For Thou, sweet Fount of Benediction,
Art near to pour the healing balm.

Hail to thee, holy Cross of ages,
That bids attempered sorrow fall;
Before thy foot no tempest rages,
No storms oppress, no passions thrall.

Hail to the holy Cross, that bringest
From weakness, strength—from sorrow, ease;
With more than eagle power, that wingest
Thy flight from earth to heavenly peace.

Hail, Ark of Peace, on thee confiding,
Fierce winds may blow, wild waves may toss;
For I am safe—by Thee abiding,
Sweet Jesus, here, before thy Cross!

Printed by Messrs. W. Rushton and Co., Calcutta, for the Proprietors,
price one rupee per month, or ten rupees per annum in advance. To non-
subscribers 8 annas per number.

THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

‘One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism’

No. XIV.

OCTOBER 5, 1839.

VOL. I.

THE REAL PRESENCE OR TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

It would occupy more of our space than we can at present well spare, to give a full exposition of the grounds of the Catholic Doctrine of the Real Presence, or Transubstantiation, against which the *Christian Advocate* has advanced a whole host of Fathers, to whose authority we find he has no objection when it suits his purpose. He has not however been fortunate on this occasion; for, if he will but refer to Bishop Trevern's able reply to Faber, and also Husenbeth's Supplement to the same, he will discover, more perhaps to his surprise than satisfaction, that Faber, whom he follows, has been convicted, on the clearest evidence, of garbling, mistranslating, and otherwise perverting the meaning of the Fathers, so as to make them appear to support precisely what his case required. Hence the quotations which the *Advocate* has adduced from *Faber's shop* will not strengthen his case; unless indeed he be of Mr. McGhee's mind, who, having palmed a letter on his enlightened audience at Exeter Hall as a Papal rescript to the Irish Bishops, stoutly maintained afterwards that it was not a bit the less valuable for being a forgery. We are happy however to find that our friend, the *Advocate*, has at last got into such good company as that of the Fathers of the Catholic Church, of which we hope to have soon the pleasure of seeing him an edifying member. We would however recommend him to consult the Fathers themselves, when he wishes to obtain their testimony on any point, rather than allow himself to be misled by so fallacious a guide as Faber. If he will adopt this course in regard to the point at issue between us, we doubt not that he will soon convince himself of the fact that the primitive Fathers held exactly the same doctrine, as to the Real Presence in the Sacrament, which Catholics now hold. He must not however boggle at not finding the word transubstantiation, which is merely a term of definition; and forms no part of the doctrine, implied in these words: *This is my body—This is my blood.* The natural import of which is so obvious, that it has been justly observed by a most talented writer, that if Christ had wished to inculcate the Catholic doctrine, he could not have done it in terms better adapted to the purpose: and if he meant to inculcate the doctrine held by Protestants,

he could hardly have selected words more likely to lead his disciples into error.

If, as our adversaries maintain, it be from the scripture alone that each individual is to cull the articles of his creed, it is but reasonable to conceive that the Holy Spirit will have delivered these articles in the sacred volumes, in terms the most natural and intelligible. To have described the most important points of Christian belief and of Christian practice, in figurative or metaphorical language, susceptible of a thousand different meanings, would have been to sow the seeds of disunion, and to perplex the mind of the sincere inquirer. We may therefore lay it down as a canon of scriptural interpretation, that the literal should be considered as the true meaning, unless there be the clearest evidence of the contrary. The neglect of this canon has opened a door to every species of religious innovation, and enabled men to explain away all the mysteries of religion.

We are perfectly aware that our Blessed Saviour sometimes spoke of himself in figurative language; but we maintain that the manifest difference between his language on those occasions, and his language at the institution of the sacrament, forms a strong argument that the latter was meant to be understood literally and not figuratively. Our adversaries are accustomed to appeal with confidence to the expressions, '*I am the vine, &c., I am the door, &c.*,' but we have still to learn on what that confidence is founded. In these propositions the predicate is indefinite: it is not demonstratively fixed to any one particular object, as in the words — *This is my body*. We do not read that Christ ever laid his hand on a vine, and said, *I am this vine*, or took hold of a door, and said, *I am this door*, in the same manner as he took the bread into his hands, and said, *This is my body*. Let the unprejudiced reader turn to the passages in question, and he will immediately see that they are allegorical;—'He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, is a thief and a robber. But he that entereth in by the door, is the shepherd of the sheep—*I am the door*: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved. *I am the vine*, and my father is the husbandman. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine: no more can ye, except ye abide in me. *I am the vine*; ye are the branches.'—From the whole context it is evident that this is figurative language: but in the institution of the Sacrament, there is not the remotest intimation that the words, '*This is my body*,' are figurative language. In the former the predicate is general and indefinite, and consequently metaphorical: in the latter both subject and predicate are definite and particular. The difference therefore between these passages, is so strikingly marked as to leave no reasonable doubt that the expression, '*This is my body*,' was meant to be understood literally.

The audience of our blessed Lord at Capernaum was divided, as we learn from the Gospel, into two parties, of those who believed, and of those who disbelieved, his mission. Both parties understood his words in their literal meaning. If the latter asked, 'How can this man give us his flesh to eat?' the former exclaimed, 'This is a hard saying, and who can hear it?' Many of them even abandoned him, and went over to his enemies. Hence we must adopt one of these two conclusions: either that our Lord did not speak of a figurative eating, or that he addressed his audience in a language, which neither his enemies nor his friends could understand. Now the latter of these suppositions appears on the very face of it utterly improbable. He did, indeed, sometimes employ enigmatical language:

but then it was on very different occasions. Here he was delivering instruction to those who sought it: he was explaining to them the most sacred and solemn ordinance in the religion which he had undertaken to establish: and consequently he would employ such language as was most proper to convey his meaning, and would explain such passages as he had perceived to be misunderstood, in the same manner as he had done on every occasion, when his hearers *wrongly* understood his figurative expressions in a literal sense: for instance when our Saviour said to Nicodemus, 'Amen, amen, I say to thee, unless a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.' Nicodemus understood this literally, and objected 'How can a man be born again when he is old?' Our Redeemer replies, 'Amen, amen, I say to thee, unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven.'

Observe here how careful our Lord was not to allow Nicodemus to remain in his mistake, which arose from a misinterpretation of the figurative expression. Many other passages might be cited to the same effect.—But did our Saviour tell his audience at Capernaum that they misunderstood him, and that he was speaking in a figurative sense? No; he endeavoured to confirm them in their opinion. He repeated his former assertion: he inculcated it in the strongest terms that language could furnish: he declared that their salvation depended on their adhesion to it; and to impress it the deeper in their minds, he confirmed it with the sanction of an oath. He even permitted his disciples to depart without offering any explanation of his doctrine which would render it less repugnant to their notions and feelings, and attributed their apostacy not to mistake but to incredulity: 'There are some of you that believe not.' This observation alone sets the question at rest. That doctrine which they disbelieved, was evidently the doctrine of really eating the body, and really drinking the blood, of Christ. Now Christ certainly would not reproach them with the disbelief of any other doctrine than that which he had taught; therefore, we may safely infer, that the doctrine of Christ respecting the eating of his body, and drinking of his blood, was to be understood in the literal, and not in a figurative sense.

After the departure of the disciples, our Lord turned to the twelve apostles, and asked them, whether they also meant to leave him. Now what was their answer? Did they say that they had not fallen into the same error as the others, but understood him to have spoken of a figurative eating and a figurative drinking? On the contrary, they appear to acknowledge that they had experienced the same difficulties, but had captivated their judgment unto the obedience of faith. They believe all that he had said, because they knew him to be the Messiah. 'Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe, and have known, that thou art the Christ, the son of the living God.' Thus, the conduct of our Lord, the incredulity of the Jews, the apostacy of the disciples, and the faith of the apostles, all concur to prove that our Saviour spoke on this occasion, of a real, and not a figurative eating of his flesh, and a real, not a figurative drinking of his blood.

Our separated brethren contend that the passage, 'It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, are spirit and life,' was meant to correct the misapplications of Christ's former words. To us the fact itself appears to demonstrate that this passage was not meant for any such purpose. Had Christ intended by it to

remove the impression, which his former discourse had made on the minds of his disciples, it would infallibly have removed that impression. Had he designed by it to teach that he had spoken of a figurative eating and drinking, they would have understood him in that sense: and if they had so understood him, they would not have abandoned him. The very fact of their having abandoned him after these words, shows that they did not consider them in the same light as the *Advocate*: for there certainly could be nothing in the figurative doctrine so shocking to the feelings and prejudices of the disciples, as to induce them to disbelieve a man, whom they had seen working the most stupendous miracles, and whom, on the faith of those miracles, they had followed as the promised Messiah. The passage in question is but an illustration, and may be thus paraphrased:— 'As it is the Spirit that quickeneth, and the body, without the spirit, is but a lifeless corpse, so the words which I have spoken to you, are the spirit and life of the soul. Unless you believe them, you are dead. And there are some among you, who believe not.'

We subjoin an extract from Carless' reply to Townsend, which we trust, will convince the *Advocate* that the Catholic doctrine, respecting the eucharist, has some pretensions to the title of Scriptural doctrine. Indeed, we do not know that any article of the Christian faith is expressed in the Sacred volumes in clearer and less exceptionable terms. And here we cannot but admire the presumptuous temerity of those men who first maintain that the Scriptures alone can be the ground of our faith, and that we are bound to believe whatever is clearly delivered in the Scriptures; and then come forward, and unblushingly propound as matters of faith, doctrines, which not only are not consonant, but are even contradictory to the express declarations of the Scriptures. Christ says, 'This is my body;' they say, 'It is not his body:' Christ says, 'My flesh is meat indeed, my blood is drink indeed,' they say, 'His flesh is not meat indeed, nor his blood drink indeed;' and because we refuse to believe them in preference to him, we are called unscriptural, ridiculed as idiots, and branded as idolaters.

'That Christ is to be adored wherever he is present I trust the Durham Prebendary will not venture to deny; and that he is really present, and therefore to be adored in the Blessed Sacrament, will not be difficult to prove. What are the words of Christ? *'And whilst they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and broke, and gave to his disciples, and said: Take ye and eat; THIS IS MY BODY. And taking the chalice, he gave thanks, and gave to them, saying: Drink ye all of this. For THIS IS MY BLOOD of the new testament which shall be shed for many for the remission of their sins.'** The words are plain. Christ says, *THIS IS MY BODY. THIS IS MY BLOOD*, and the Catholic believes him. How will Mr. Townsend prove that the words of Christ are not to be taken in their literal sense? Had what our Saviour gave to his disciples been mere elements, it is impossible that our Divine Saviour could have used the above words. But what will Mr. Townsend say to the description given in St. John? Our Saviour there compares the Blessed Sacrament to the manna. *'Your fathers did eat manna in the desert, and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven: that if any man eat of it, he may not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever. And the bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world.'*† Now, had the Blessed Sacrament been mere ele-

* St. Matt. xxvi, 26, 27, 28.

† St. John, vi, 49, &c.

ments, our Saviour could never have thus given it the preference to the manna, much less could he have said, '*If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever.*' In the above verses is contained the doctrine of the Catholic Church, and that the Jews understood him in the literal sense is evident from the next verse. *The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying: How can this man give us his flesh to eat?* Like the Jews Mr. Townend also exclaims, '*How can this man give us his flesh to eat?*' Let our Saviour reply, '*Then Jesus said to them, Amen. I say unto you, Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life; and I will raise him up in the last day. FOR MY FLESH IS MEAT INDEED, AND MY BLOOD IS DRINK INDEED. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him. As the living father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me. This is the bread that came down from heaven. Not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead. He that eateth this bread shall live for ever. These things he said teaching in the synagogue, in Capharnaum. Many therefore of his disciples hearing it, said, This saying is hard, and who can hear it?*' But Jesus, knowing in himself that his disciples murmured at this, said to them, *Doth this scandalize you? If then you shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?*' But, says the Protestant, our Saviour only means a spiritual manducation, as is proved from the following verse: '*It is the spirit that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I have spoken to you, are spirit and life.*' As this is the great argument on which the Protestant rests his disbelief of the real presence, the reader will excuse me in dwelling upon it. I will meet it fairly, and I trust it will not be difficult to convince every impartial mind how weak must be the edifice erected upon such a foundation. Even our adversaries acknowledge that the whole chapter, as far as the sixty-fourth verse, establishes in the strongest manner the Catholic doctrine of the real presence. My task, therefore, is to prove that this verse does not militate against it. Our Saviour had told the assembled multitudes that the bread that he would give was his *flesh for the life of the world*. The Jews are the first to question his word. To the Jews, who seem to have been ruled by their passions, our Saviour does not condescend to offer a proof, but replies positively: '*Except you eat the body of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you.*' '*For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.*' But, his disciples say, '*This saying is hard, and who can hear it?*' Jesus pities their weakness, and condescends to prove: '*But Jesus, knowing in himself that his disciples murmured at this, said to them, Doth this scandalize you? If then you shall see the Son of man ascend up, where he was before?*'

Here our Saviour so far from telling his disciples that they misunderstood his doctrine as to the real presence, adduces his ascension as a proof of it, telling them that when they have seen him ascend into heaven, they will no longer be scandalized, no longer question his words. But, to correct the gross and carnal ideas of some of them, who supposed that they should lacerate and divide his body amongst them, he adds, '*It is the spirit that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing,*' in understanding spiritual things, shewing them that they were not to understand him in the gross manner I have described, that in explaining the mystery he had just proposed they were not to judge by the corporal senses, '*the flesh profiteth nothing,*' '*The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life,* and it is by the spirit you must be governed in your judgment of spiritual things. That this is the signification of our Divine Redeemer, and that he did not intend to contradict his previous words, is again evident from his following expression, and from the subsequent conduct of some of the disciples. Our Saviour still complaining of the little faith of his disciples, repeats, '*But there are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the begin-*

ning who they were that did not believe, and who he was that would betray him. And he said : Therefore did I say to you, that no man can come to me, unless it be given him by my Father. After this many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him.' 'After this,' after what let me ask ? After Christ had confirmed his previous words, '*many of his disciples went back.*' This is really so evident that it requires no comment. That these disciples understood him of a real manducation must be certain, or why did they '*walk no more with him* ? Then Jesus said to the twelve : *Will you also go away ?* And Simon Peter answered him : *Lord, to whom shall we go ? thou hast the words of eternal life, And we have believed and have known that thou art the Christ, the Son of God.** And therefore we believe thy words.

To the man who still hesitates to believe the Catholic doctrine of the real presence I propose the following questions : and pause for a reply. Why did our Redeemer Christ say '*My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed* ? He who knew all things, knew that both the multitudes then assembled before him, and the great majority of the Christian world till the end of time, would understand his words in the literal sense. Was it then consistent with the nature of a God to use expressions, which, if he did not intend to be received in their literal sense, he knew he would so soon be compelled to contradict ? Was it consistent with the goodness of a God who assumed our nature to redeem lost man, to use a form of language, which would, according to the Protestant, bury a great portion of the world in idolatry ; and thus with one hand destroy the edifice of Christianity, which he was erecting with the other, at the price of his blood ? more than this, could he have replied to the Jews, '*Amen, amen, I say unto you ; except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. FOR MY FLESH IS MEAT INDEED ; AND MY BLOOD IS DRINK INDEED.*' More than all, could he have allowed his disciples to go back, and walk no more with him, when by explaining himself in the sense of the Protestant, he might so easily have corrected their errors, and brought them back ? Again would it have been necessary for him to appeal to the '*twelve,*' and ask them, '*will you also go away ?*' and would it have been necessary to draw from the Apostles an explicit act of faith, '*Lord, to whom shall we go ? thou hast the words of eternal life ?*'

Christian reader, are you willing to draw upon yourself the threat of your Redeemer, '*Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you* ? Are you willing to be deprived of the reward promised to him who eateth His flesh, and drinketh His blood ? '*He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life ; and I will raise him up in the last day.*'

That a doubt should exist in the mind of any one who attentively reads the sixth chapter of St. John, appears to me impossible. Had the words been ambiguous, I should have reasoned with Mr. Townsend in the following manner : You tell us that the substance we receive in the Lord's Supper is mere bread and wine. I say that we receive the body and blood of Christ. How is the point to be decided ? 'Oh !' exclaims Mr. Townsend, 'your doctrine is absurd.' So said the Jews. But, pardon me, Sir, you forget that the leading rule of Protestantism is, that each one must read and judge for himself. I have not the presumption, certainly, to claim an equal discernment or judgment with Mr. Townsend, but according to your rule, I am bound, let my ignorance be what it may, not to rest my salvation on the opinion of another, but to judge for myself. Now, I believe what I receive, to be Christ, and that I am bound to adore him. How, then, according to your rule, am I guilty of idolatry ?

* St. John, vi. 65, &c.

† The reader who wishes for further information on this important subject would do well to consult the excellent work of Mr. Des Mahis, entitled, '*The Truth of the Catholic Religion proved from the Holy Scriptures.*'

It must be evident to every impartial mind, that the Catholic cannot be guilty of idolatry in the adoration which he pays to the Eucharist. What he adores he believes to be Christ, and were he, by any possibility, even under a mistake, he still is not guilty of idolatry, his adoration, in that case, is referred to Christ, and Christ *only* does he adore.'

The second letter from M. Abbey Chastan, Apostolic Missionary published in the *Bas-Alpin*, is addressed to M. A..... It contains interesting particulars of the manners and religion of the country. The following is a free translation of it:

The last letter, which I had the honor of writing to you from the frontiers of China, on the 31st December of the last year, informed you of my departure from China, and my near entrance into Corea. It is now from the centre of this mission, which for some years I had a great desire to join, that I have the honor of writing to you this one; which perhaps may be the last: we cannot promise ourselves peace for a week, and if persecution breaks out, adieu, my dear cousin! Till now I only dreamt that I was beheaded, but then it will be in reality. I have just finished my retreat, and am prepared for this second baptism, should it be the will of God to bestow on me this great favor, fiat! fiat! When I came to this capital, and heard the account of the torments which were inflicted on a pious christian virgin named Agatha, the queen's ex-servant, who yielded her soul to God on the 1st January, in the midst of her torments. I felt myself seized with a very afflictive fear, which lasted 8 days; at present, thank God, I find consolation in this thought, and we are speaking of this affair with my dear fellow-brother and my catechist, as of a feast which is preparing for us; their fathers have shared in it, in the foregoing persecution.

I am very happy to find myself in this mission, and in it I hope to finish my days, which probably will not be many: a thousand times happy if I can find that *Margaritam* of which our Saviour speaks in the Gospel, and for which a Christian ought to give every thing. In this consolation, there is nothing to grieve at the persons, the places, and the objects which I have abandoned. You have asked me to write to you some particulars concerning the religion and manners of the country in which I live, I have not yet satisfied you on this point, and I cannot, for the present, write to you at any length on this subject. These, however, are my sentiments: the religion which can be called the religion of the state, consists in honoring Confucius and his ancestors. The lower classes of people worship idols; the adoration of Fo is sufficiently diffused. The Bonzes despised by the great, cannot have their temples in the capital, nor can they even enter it under pain of death; the licentious conduct of their predecessors has merited for them this punishment. The nobility are nevertheless very superstitious. It is generally believed that the good fortune of families depends on the choice of place for burials. The children mourn for their parents three years. During this time they can neither exercise the duty of a mandarin, nor depart from their houses to pay visits; they are clad in a long gown of very coarse silk, they have their waists tied with a cord, and their head covered with a great cap, in form of a bell; morning and evening they weep, so as to be heard all over the neighbourhood. At least twice a month they offer sacrifices for the soul of the deceased, and send immolated meat to their neighbours; they also observe fasts and abstinences in honor of these souls.

The nobility thus infatuated with this superstitious worship, despise the Christian religion because it condemns it. The last persecutor carried his hatred so far as to compare our brethren to vile beasts; shortly after he died aged only 20 years; the fire suddenly caught the funeral decoration and consumed a part of it, as also a side of the palace. The first actual minister, regent of the kingdom, did not wish, last year, to renew the persecution; because, said he, the foregoing persecutions had produced no good effect on the

royal family, of which there remains only one little scion 11 years old; they have given him a spouse nearly of the same age as himself. When the news of our arrival had reached the ears of this first minister, he is said to have exclaimed: 'The Europeans are come to announce their religion, *to leave them in peace*, is dangerous; to persecute them is still worse. Let us rest quiet.' Would to God that this be true. An intimate friend of this minister, is a friend too of religion, and consequently of missionaries; he aids us to the utmost of his power. Our hope is in the Lord. They will behead us then when it will please God to permit them; in the mean time, we will continue in our way, without minding people's talk, either through the town or country. I have now been three months in this capital; to-morrow morning I will set out in my journey. As our poor Christians, especially those of my district, inhabit the mountains, and as they are dispersed in all sides, I expect to pass a somewhat troublesome winter. Our Christians in general, and especially the 15 confessors of faith, who are kept in prison till the day of their persecution, will have many other sufferings to endure. The mandarine, who ordered the legs of the pious Agatha to be broken, declared that he did not wish to put her to death, but to force her to apostatize; he gave liberty to three catechumens who had the weakness to apostatize: he promised the same to as many others as were willing to follow the example.

It is now some years since a minister of Satan attempted to kill not only bodies but even souls. He ordered 5 confessors at once to be led to the place of execution, condemned to death 3 years ago; when they arrived thither, he promised them pardon if they renounced their religion, fully determined to put them to death, even if they had apostatized. Three Christians answered that they had taken their resolution, and that they would never change it, neither through fear of dying, nor through hope of living; their heads were instantly cut off. The Mandarine thought that the two Christian women would be dismayed at the sight of these bloody corpse; he urged them by every reason and motive, which the demon could suggest to him to apostatize; as they remained firm in their resolution, he ordered them to be stretched with their faces towards the earth and their necks resting on a block of wood 4 inches in diameter. Before he ordered the executioner to strike, being touched with a kind of hypocritical pity, he commanded them to rise, and promised, them for the second time, pardon and money to live at their ease: they replied that nothing in the world would make them renounce their faith; he again made them stretch as before, then rise, and asked them, if the sight of these 3 bloody corpse did not terrify them. They answered, that the crown of glory with which God had already rewarded their friends in heaven, excited them to ask for the same grace; and that was given to them at that very instant.

Many noble families are now exasperated against our holy religion, because a part of their dependents have embraced it, and some of them are persecuted to the utmost even by their own parents. Last Sunday, a girl of about ten years demanded baptism of me, promising to suffer martyrdom rather than consent to marry a pagan, or renounce her faith. Each day presents some edifying example. To enter into these melancholy details would occupy too much space. Next year, if through the grace of God I arrive here, I shall have the pleasure of writing to you again. The letter to my family has been in China, and is returned, because our couriers could not be found on the frontiers to receive our letters. Pray for me, my dear cousin, and ask virtuous men to pray for this interesting mission of Corea. It will become flourishing, if the Lord will shower down his blessings on the pastors and flocks.

A CLEAR EXPOSITION OF THE FOUR CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TRUE CHURCH.

(Continued from No. XII.)

Our Church is HOLY. It is expressly avowed by our adversaries that salvation can be obtained in the Catholic Church. Mahomet admits it in the 20th chapter of the Koran. Luther in his book *On the abrogation of Muss*, and Melancthon in the 5th and 20th articles of his *Apology*, gives Bernard, Dominic and Francis the appellation of Saints. If *Saints*, then they are saved; and if saved, salvation can be obtained in the religion which they professed, and which by our separated brethren is politely denominated *Popery*: on this score in fact they are generally agreed, teaching that the portals of heaven are wide open for every Christian. Hence we may here adopt the argument used by that great monarch of Navarre, who, when pressed by his preachers to continue a member of their sect, manfully replied: 'You grant that I *can* be saved in the Catholic religion; the Catholics on the contrary teach, that I *cannot* be saved in *your* faith; it is then the safest plan to embrace that religion, in which both admit that salvation can be obtained.' A powerful argument! Would to Heaven, that our dissenting friends penetrated its force, and imitated the noble example set before them. The shipwreck of souls seems to us to resemble the universal destruction of men by the deluge. At the bursting of the heavenly cataracts some, we suppose, shut themselves up in their houses, and others clambered up the mountains, but all in vain! Neither house nor mountains could preserve them from the mighty scourge: in the Ark alone there was safety and protection. In like manner in the spiritual deluge, some with Mahometans and Atheists lock themselves up in the obscurity of their ignorance, others with our heterodox brethren attempt to occupy the eminences with the sublimity of their sophisms; but deluded beings! Why do they not take shelter in the Ark of the Catholic faith, '*which unless every one faithfully and firmly believe, he cannot be saved*?' (Athanas. Symb.)

Further, Heaven is the country of Saints. Now, how on earth can the numberless sects out of the pale of our church lay claim to sanctity, while they profess doctrines intolerably absurd? If we open the Koran, we find that learning is sacrilegious; that dense ignorance is the peculiar qualification of a Mahometan; that wine-drinking and chess-playing are grievous excesses, while polygamy and depredations are first-rate virtues. Among Christians, the Manichees held that one should have equal remorse for the plucking of a tree-leaf, as for the murder of a fellow-being; that the butchery of one's parent or prince is not a greater crime than the articulation of an idle word. The Carpocratians maintained that no body can enter heaven without previously wading through all the iniquities of the earth! But to pass over in silence sects long since buried in oblivion, Luther teaches that subjects will not be punished by God, even though they were to imbrue their hands in the blood of their Rulers, provided they conserve a lively belief in self-justification. It was his favourite exhortation: '*Sin bravely, but believe more firmly*,' or more expressively in Latin: '*Pecca fortiter, crede fortius*,' and a thousand hells will not hurt thee! Triumph O reformers in so saintly a patriarch! Calvin enjoins on parents not to demand of their children repentance of their excesses, or of their outrages

against them. Melancthon proclaims that the perverse may impute to God all the guilt of their iniquities, because in his comments on the 8th chapter of St. Paul to the Romans, he blasphemously avers, '*that the treachery of Judas was as much God's work, as the conversion of Paul!*' It is true that he afterwards retracted this impious assertion, but however it is still the doctrine of modern innovators that man's will is not free, but is always necessitated to act by God, so that He is not only the physical but also the moral cause of every wickedness.—Can such doctrines be of God, who is essentially holy?

Now witness their humility. Luther in his book '*Against the cursed King of England,*' asks: 'What are all Princes, all Kings, Emperors or Pontiffs? What are they? They are not worthy to loose the latches of my shoes: mankind, whether it will or not, *must consider me a saint.* A thousand Cyprians, a thousand Jeromes, a thousand Augustins are not worth half a Luther.' He likewise openly avows that he had had most confidential interviews with the Father of pride, and that it was by the suggestions and persuasions of that lying Master that he had abolished the Mass. Surely our sensible adversaries should blush to have such an Apostle!

Calvin also presents beautiful specimens of sanctity. At one time he is seen jumping from a window in Paris, to escape the fangs of justice, which he has provoked by his crimes; at another you behold him in Angoulême, expelled from a hotel by his host; at another in Noyon, he is whipped for his shameful debaucheries. Finally, he is described by his bosom friend Bucer as haughty, choleric, cruel, intolerable to all, and of all intolerant. In a word there is not one of the Lights of the Reformation, whose sanctity can stand the test of an impartial crucible. They exclude, it is true, the '*Invocation of Saints,*' but perhaps they exclude it, because they are well aware that from the first to the last of them, from MARTIN himself to the shoemaker preacher, there is not one really deserving of that glorious appellation.

(To be continued.)

'DANCING AND CHRISTIANS.'

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—To what extent a *Scriptural Christian* may be carried away by his fervor and zeal in interpreting Scripture according to his own whim and caprice, has been in a great measure developed by the Conductors of the *Advocate*, in a *luminous* article under the above title. Without wishing to enter into the question of the propriety, or otherwise, of dancing, may I ask you, Mr. Editor, what man in Christendom, besides the erudite Conductors of the renowned *Advocate*, could have the sagacity to discover from the Bible, that '*it is as important that a Christian should dance in a scriptural manner as that he should dance at, and in scriptural time?*' It would also appear from the same source, that '*it would be as criminal to dance at the wrong time as to neglect to dance at the right time.*' The sage writer then asks '*what part of the day should be given up to dancing, shall we devote the precious time of the morning, or the hour of noon, or shall the votaries of Thespis seek the dark mantle of night for their worship?*' The first is too precious, the second too hot, and the night meeting fraught with too many

evils physical, mental, and moral to risk its influence.' After citing *certain passages* from the BIBLE, he winds up his peroration with these grave remarks—'from these quotations it would appear, that dancing was a *religious* act: that it was performed by *maidens only*—that it was performed usually in the day time, in the open air, in highways, fields, or groves—that men who perverted dancing from its original purpose, were deemed infamous—that no instance is found in which the two sexes united either as an act of worship or amusement, and that there is no instance on record of *social dancing* for amusement.' Will the reader believe that this free and *independent* manner of reasoning, is deduced from the text. '*A time to weep, and a time to laugh, a time to mourn, and a time to dance.*' Eccles. viii. 4. Well did the indignant Zanchius say of his fellow Protestants, '*We torture the Scriptures till they agree with our own fancies.*' Scriptural Christians, look ye to this !!

AU REVOIR.

Calcutta, 1st Oct., 1839.

Selections.

ON LIBERALITY.

BY DR. ENGLAND.

LIBERALITY in religion is the making to others the most ample concessions which *truth* will allow.

To deny known truth is not *liberality*, it is criminal *falsehood*.

In revealed religion, those doctrines which God manifests to man are truths, because God could not reveal falsehood. When he reveals them they are *known*.

We may have such evidence of the transmission to us of those revealed doctrines as would enable us to be *certain* of their *identity*. When we have such evidence, those doctrines are to us *known truths*.

Every Roman Catholic believes that he possesses such evidence respecting the doctrines of his Church. Therefore every Roman Catholic believes with certainty that the doctrines of his Church have been revealed by God, and, consequently, to him they are *known truths*; hence for him to deny such truths would not be *liberality*; it would be *criminal falsehood*.

An Algebraist sees clearly that two negative quantities multiplied will produce an affirmative result. Many persons, upon hearing this asserted, would laugh at what they would consider to be contradictory, absurd, impossible. Is the scholar to give up his knowledge? Will it be *liberality* in him to say, 'my good friend, let us not quarrel; you may be right and I may be wrong. No man is infallible. We can have no certainty. Every man has a right to his own opinion?'

This language may be fashionable, is it correct?

What should a scholar say? 'Gentlemen, I have no doubt of the truth of my doctrine, I have evidence of its truth. I cannot, therefore, be in error—truth and falsehood are not matters of indifference. Reduce your principle of calculation to practice. All its correct results must inevitably be wrong. All the correct results of mine must inevitably be right. But, in God's name, let us be friends. You cannot from me expect the assertion of a falsehood, viz. that I am wrong, and that you are right; nor can you expect from me the assertion of an absurdity, viz. that two persons who maintain contradictory propositions are both right. But we may agree to live together in peace, each holding his own doctrine, and using what arguments he will to support it,

provided they be consistent with the public peace, with decorum, and with kind feeling.

Similar to this is the language which liberality in religion requires the Roman Catholic to use, and it is the only liberal language which truth permits.

But does not the Roman Catholic Church teach, that not only are her doctrines exclusively true, but, farther, whoever will not enter into her communion will be damned? And does not she teach that they who dissent from her doctrines ought to be persecuted in this world before they are damned in the next? And is not this the very essence of illiberality?

Each of these propositions bear the semblance of truth, and all of them put together, carry with them the appearance of reasoning. We shall examine them separately for their truth, together for their consequences. Taken separately, they run thus:—

1st.—*The Roman Catholic Church teaches that her doctrines, being those which have been revealed by God, are true, and, of course, any assertion or doctrine which contradicts any of them, must of necessity be false.*—This is conceded—such is the fact.

2nd.—*The Roman Catholic Church teaches that whosoever will not enter into, and is not found in her communion, will be damned.*

The Roman Catholic Church does **NOT** teach this proposition in the several meanings which it is calculated to convey. In fact, the Roman Catholic Church teaches *no such proposition*. But she teaches that ‘*Faith is necessary to salvation*,’ that ‘*without the true Faith no person can be saved*.’ In the words of St. Paul, ‘*that without Faith it is impossible to please God*.’ Now these latter propositions differ essentially from that which is marked No. 2.

But what is the extent of the latter propositions? Exactly the extent of their subject in the propositions which is their equivalent, *Only those persons who have Faith are capable of salvation*. The extent of the subject, then, is *all they who have Faith*. To discover them we must know what the Roman Catholic Church means by *Faith*. She teaches that ‘*FAITH IS THE SINCERE DISPOSITION TO BELIEVE ALL THAT GOD HAS TAUGHT*.’

Therefore the Roman Catholic Church extends the capacity for salvation to all those who are *sincerely disposed to believe ALL that God has taught*. She calls those persons who will not believe in Revelation, and who, therefore, reject *ALL* the doctrines, *infidels*; because they have no faith in what God has said. She calls those who believe some of the doctrines of Revelation, and disbelieve the rest, *heretics*—that is, *choosers*, from the Greek word *harieo*, to choose; because, instead of faithfully receiving *ALL*, they make choices, some receiving what others reject, and all being led by fancy, not by evidence of testimony; thus no one of them receives *ALL*, and most of them differ in their selections. She calls those who receive *ALL* the doctrines *Faithful*, and also *Catholics*. There can be no illiberality in using appropriate names, whose etymology accurately designates, without any reproach or obloquy, those who, in fact, differ, and who, therefore, must be accurately and differently described.

We now inquire *does the Roman Catholic Church confine this disposition to believe ALL that God has taught to those who profess her faith, and who live in her external communion?* She does not. If such be the case, she then does not confine capacity for salvation to those persons. In order to understand the assertion—‘*SHE DOES NOT*,’ let us inquire what are her limits? Thus we shall know ‘*whom she excludes*.’

A new and most important distinction now presents itself to us between those who *give evidence of their dispositions*, and those who, *having the disposition, do not exhibit the evidence*, for it is plain, a disposition may exist of whose existence we do not discover evidence.

All those who openly profess the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church are by her rationally considered to have Faith, because they have by their professions declared their belief of *ALL* that God has taught. Those persons are properly considered as having that disposition, of whose existence they

have given positive evidence. But, although they are thus looked upon as *capable of salvation*, their actual enjoyment thereof is not secured by their capacity. They must do all those acts which will ensure the enjoyment of eternal life, otherwise, though salvation be within their reach, they will not be saved.

Others, it is true, may have the disposition without giving the evidence. The Church can only judge upon evidence. They give none. She decides rationally upon the principle, *de non apparentibus, et non existentibus eadem est ratio*. There is no capacity for salvation. Some of those parties answer *we have Faith*. We believe, but we do not believe all that you teach. She proposes to them doctrines which *she is certain* are the revelations of God. Those persons dissent; they reject the doctrines. Here is a case not merely of want of evidence, for there is here distinct evidence of rejecting doctrines taught by God; she is therefore fully warranted in deciding as reason compels; '*there is here no faith.*'

Does she not then teach distinctly that every individual who does not believe all her doctrines and profess her religion will be damned? No. Because her conclusion is not metaphysically, it is only morally universal; and is not, therefore, applicable to every special case, though it be applicable to the generality of cases. The general conclusion is, by strict logical deduction, inevitable from the scriptural principle—'*that without Faith it is impossible to please God.*' But we cannot say the same of special conclusions, because there may, and actually do exist a number of cases, many of which, I am convinced, have fallen under my own observation, in which the disposition to believe exists, but where the usual evidence of that disposition cannot be given. In many more, I am inclined to think, the disposition may exist without any possibility of obtaining evidence thereof.

I shall give a few examples.

1st. A person to whom the doctrine was never preached may have the disposition to believe.

2nd.—A person to whom the doctrine was misrepresented may be disposed to believe, though he may, from being told that the Church taught absurdities and contradictions, and immoral principles, be disgusted with what he was taught were her doctrines, and be without the opportunity of correcting his errors.

3d. A person of weak or perverted intellect may have the disposition to believe, and at the same time may mistake error for truth.

Other instances might be added in which the disposition may exist, but the evidence not be given. None of those persons profess the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, yet that Church extends to them, as well as to those who profess her doctrines, capacity for salvation. Therefore she does not confine that capacity to those in her external communion.

But, although the Church does not possess evidence by which she can discern those individuals, and upon which she could pronounce them to be *members of her body*, yet they are a *portion of her soul*. God, who searches the hearts of men, and who knows their disposition, discerns them; grants to them the benefit of their faith; and though they are not acknowledged members, yet they are claimed as truly within the pale of the Church. Thus the general propositions are true. '*Without faith it is impossible to please God.*' '*Out of the Church there is no salvation.*' The Roman Catholic Church.

'All persons are obliged to be members of the one true Church.' Yet the Church would condemn as rash, presumptuous, illiberal, uncharitable, dangerous and unjustifiable, that special conclusion, '*but this individual is not in the Church. Therefore this individual would be damned.*'

Whichever probabilities may exhibit themselves to our judgment, we can have no certainty of the truth of the second proposition:—'*But this individual is not in the Church,*' and, without a certainty of its truth, we can never arrive at the special conclusion. It is true we may know that he does not belong to the body; he is not in the *external communion*; but whatever may be the

force of probable circumstances, not even sometimes the declaration of the individual himself; in many cases nothing short of supernatural revelation can give us a certainty that he does not belong to *the soul of the Church*. Therefore, although a Roman Catholic does believe that it is necessary for salvation to be a member of the true Church, and that the Roman Catholic Church only is that true Church; still he does not hold, *nor is he obliged to believe*, that every person who is not in her external communion will be damned; nor will truth require, nor charity justify, his forming special conclusions: *he knows who will be damned*. The eternal condemnation of the wicked, is the prerogative EXCLUSIVELY of God; and one which MAN CANNOT USURP.

Nothing herein contained can excuse, or even extenuate, the heavy criminality of those who are careless in seeking after the *true Church*; or who, having discovered it, basely and wickedly neglect to bear testimony to God's truth through mean or mercenary human motives.

3d. We now come to the next proposition:—'*The Roman Catholic teaches that the dissenters from her doctrines ought to be persecuted in this world before they are damned in the next.*'

She teaches NO SUCH DOCTRINE.

Does she not anathematize and curse all heretics? No—she anathematizes, that is, rejects, detests, condemns and reprobates *heresy*, and not heretics. The erroneous *doctrine*, not the *individuals*. The doctrine may be detested, and execrated, and condemned, whilst the persons who have been innocently led to its adoption, may be pitied and beloved. The original seducer, the heresiarch, who, in his pride and malice devised the error, and obstinately and contumaciously, and cunningly led others to adopt, and they who in like manner, plainly exhibit the malice of depravity, may be condemned and reprobated, without lessening the pity or affection for those whom they seduce.

Let me suppose a person mixes a deleterious intoxicating draught, and induces many to partake of it, under the expectation on their part of improving their health; suppose I warn those deluded persons, whom he invites to take his potation: suppose I threaten my children with my displeasure should they yield to the seduction: suppose him to be aided in his plans by men of plausible appearance, who proclaim me to be a jealous tyrant, who would deprive my children and all others of the benefits which this amalgamator would confer, because those benefits are not of my own invention: suppose my admonitions and threats to be disregarded, and that I see my friends and my children raving and pining in their intoxication: can I not condemn the seducer and his assistants, and execrate the poisonous beverage, whilst at the same time, I weep over my friends, and lament, and love, and pity them and my children? And can I not describe and bewail what I foresee will be the consequences of their misconduct, without being justly chargeable with desiring those consequences? These are consequences which I cannot avoid foreseeing, and which I am anxious to avert; but which from the plans of the seducer, and the strength of the poison, and the lamentable delusion of my friends and of my children, I am unable to prevent.

If a Roman Catholic finds persons seduced into error of doctrine, and tells them that the consequence of their losing their faith will be perdition, is it not rather evidence of his sincere desire to save them from ruin, than a wish to plunge them into damnation? If a man walks carelessly towards the brink of a precipice is it my wish that he should be dashed to pieces, because I cry out to him that he will inevitably be lost if he proceeds? Suppose I saw him advancing, and knew the consequences, and calmly look on in silence, or carelessly and smilingly told him that, indeed all the paths were equally safe, and that he ought to walk where he chose, and he fell and was destroyed; would my silence or my delusive flattery be charity, benevolence or liberality?

Thus the Roman Catholic is not illiberal: FIRST—'When he asserts the *exclusive truth of his doctrine.*' SECONDLY—'When he publishes the consequences of error in faith.' As well might the robber charge the moralist with

illiberality for publishing damnation to be the consequence of robbery. If God declares the penalty for the transgression, there can be no illiberality in stating the fact of God's declaration. **THIRDLY**—'*Nor does his religion require of a Roman Catholic to believe that any individual out of the external communication of his Church, will be damned.*' **FOURTHLY**—'*Nor is his condemnation of heresy evidence of his dislike of the deluded individual who professes the erroneous doctrine.*'

But does not his religion require of him to hate all those whom he knows to be doomed to damnation? Does it not oblige him to hate all God's enemies, and is not every heretic an enemy to God?

His religion does *not* require of him to *hate any person*, but it *commands* him to *love all persons*, and to do good to all: nor could he, if that obligation of hatred were his principle, reduce it to practice. The principle would oblige him to hate millions of his fellow Catholics, because, unfortunately, among them there are millions whose corruption of life is detestable, and who are greater enemies to God, than are numbers of heretics and infidels. Millions of Catholics, whose misconduct will insure their damnation. How many hypocrites are there with sanctified exterior, and filled with rottenness, concealed from the eye of man. By the imputed principle, all those must be hated. How shall they be known? Thousands who lived in error, during many years, ultimately embraced truth, and became the brightest ornaments of the Church. From the East and West they came to sit down with Abraham and Isaac, and Jacob, and the children of the kingdom are cast out. How shall we draw the bounding line which must separate those who stand together; now in infidelity; now in heresy; now in Catholicity? All who live in the profession of infidelity are not infidels. All who live in the profession of heresy are not heretics. All who live in the profession of Catholicism are not Catholics.—We have before seen several grounds of exception on one side; there are some upon the other; and many individuals stand upon each of these grounds. We could not, therefore, know whom to hate, where there an obligation of hatred. *The principle is false*, and even if true, it would be impracticable as a rule of conduct. It is false, for the gospel tells us we must hate no person. Though we may reprobate the conduct of many, we must love all. And that gospel is the code which contains the principles of the Roman Catholic. To that gospel the imputed principle is a plain contradiction. The principles of Roman Catholics are not contradictory.

What then is religious liberality? The assertion of truth—the rejection of error—the love of all mankind, without the sacrifice of our principle. In a word, it is **CHRISTIAN CHARITY**. It *first* loves God and his truth, and adheres firmly to his revelation. It *next* exhibits the practical love of every individual of the human race, without excluding sect or nation, from benevolence of feeling, and exertion for their welfare. It accords with evidence, it is allied to consistency, it urges us to search for the revealed doctrines of God, to **BELIEVE** and to **PROFESS THEM**: when likely to be profitable to others; to manifest them; when such manifestation would be practically useless or be injurious, to continue silent. It forbids us to flatter vice or to encourage error. It commands us to hate *no man*—to persecute *no man*—to live in harmony with **ALL men**—to assist as far as we can, those who need it; whether their religious belief be correct or erroneous; to practise the duties of religion at the proper time and in the proper place; not to make of them an ostentatious exhibition; yet to give good example; not to annoy others by prying into their belief or conduct, except when our station makes it our duty: not to limit our friendship and good will to those only who agree with us in faith; and whilst we endeavour to regulate our own conduct with propriety, to avoid speaking of the faults, or judging of the practice or the claims to salvation of our neighbour.

In a word, religious liberality teaches us *to do unto all men as we would they should do unto us*. This is the liberality of a Roman Catholic. It is not that unreasonableness, unmeasured abandonment of every principle of common sense

and of religion, which *places truth and falsehood upon a level*; and rushing blindly from the extravagance of bigotry, to the extreme of folly, declaims much but means nothing; which puts contradictions in juxta position, and is unable or unwilling to perceive the absurdity; which lavishly bestows every thing to every claimant, and preserving nothing for itself, soon is found to be destitute of reason, consistency, even of common decorum. True liberality is to make every human being the utmost concession which truth, justice, and decency will permit.

In the above observations I have assumed as granted, what could be proved with facility, and what every Roman Catholic is bound to believe, viz. **‘THAT EVERY DOCTRINE OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH HAS BEEN REVEALED BY GOD.**

JOHN, Bishop of Charleston.

FLOWERS FROM THE HOLY FATHERS.

No. VIII.

‘Paratum cor meum, Deus, paratum cor meum. (Ps. 56. 8.)—Paratum quantum ad adversa, paratum quantum ad prospera; paratum ad humilia, paratum ad sublimia, paratum ad universa quæ præceperis.’—*Sic Bernardi.*

Say, should my heavenly spouse desire,
That I shall pass through misery’s fire—
Say, should he wish me weak or poor,
Lord! I am ready to endure
Weakness or sorrow, wound or ache,
Such is my will for Jesus’ sake.

Should toil or labour be my lot,
Should trouble, and vexatious thought,
Should angry skies in storm look down—
For toil or trouble—rage or frown—
Lord! I am ready to fulfil
With simple heart—thy holy will!—

Or should’st thou wish to mould my clay,
To glory—meekly I obey.
—That I should live oppress’d and worn,
A vessel of contempt and scorn,
So that thy ready grace be mine,
Be done in me, thy will divine.

For injury—detraction loud—
For malice—contumely proud,
For angry jar, and foul despite,
For calumny, or tyrannous might—
If in all these, sweet Jesus, Thou,
Be there—behold me ready now!

For joy or sorrow, good or ill,
Jesus; my heart is ready still,
Meekly prepared to follow thee,
To Tabor, or to Calvary.
Oh! Be thy holy will alone,
And nought but thine in me be done!

Printed by Messrs. W. Rushton and Co., Calcutta, for the Proprietors,
price one rupee per month, or ten rupees per annum in advance. To non-
subscribers 8 annas per number.

THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

'One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.'

No. XV.

OCTOBER 12, 1839.

VOL. I.

A gentleman, who under the signature of ELIA, has stood forward to support the tottering cause of the *Advocate*, twice solemnly asserts, in his article of the 21st number, that 'the INSUFFICIENCY of Scripture, as a rule of faith,' is a main pillar of the Catholic Church. Though, undoubtedly, she has strong and unshaken columns to uphold and sustain her divinely-built fabric, yet we are indebted to the ingenuity of a *Christian Advocate* writer, for the surprising information, that the WANT of a thing is a main pillar which supports her. She rests, we know, on the entire written and unwritten word of God, which lend a mutual support to each other, whilst the Protestant Church has nothing but the Bible, humanly interpreted, for its groundwork. In showing the insufficiency and absurdity of the Bible being alone used as a rule of faith, we had fondly thought to prove, that the Protestant Religion, which admits no other, has but a frail and unstable prop for its support. But we comprehend the meaning of ELIA. Feeling the dreadful shock which our reasoning gave his faith, but unwilling to ascribe it to weakness, he, by a bold figure of speech, has graciously transformed the engine which battered down his own church into a buttress for ours. With a view to show the instability of the Protestant Church, which rests on God's word unproved, and made man's word by human interpretation, we aimed a severe blow at her frail single support, and she shakes, as if ready to fall. For she resembles the terrific statue which Nabuchadnezzar saw in his dream. Its head was of fine gold; its breast and arms of silver; its thighs of brass; its legs of iron, but its feet were part of iron and part of clay; so that when the stone from the mountain struck against them, the whole statue fell to the ground, and was shattered to pieces. The Protestant Religion, made up of every kind of material, raises its gold-shining head proudly in the air; extends its arms of silver in authority over the land; and bestriding the earth like a Colossus with its iron legs, it strikes awe and terror into many a beholder. Undismayed by its semblance of might, yet provoked by the insults which it loves to offer to our Faith, we have hurled the stone of 'Scripture-Insufficiency' at its feet, which we saw were composed partly of the divine word unproved, and partly of frail, brittle, human interpretation. The whole statue totters on its unsound base: it is even now nodding to its fall: it threatens already to sink to the earth, and crumble into ruins.

Though, roused by our repeated challenge, the *Advocate*, in his last number, has at length condescended to speak on 'the sufficiency of scripture as a rule,' yet he contrives to avoid the real difficulty; which consists in proving, without the aid of Tradition, the divine inspiration of the scriptures, and the correctness of his interpretation. This he knows, because it is self-evident, to be beyond his power. Obligated, therefore, to make a reply, he is resolved to conduct it with his wonted prudence and discretion. Eager to divert the public eye from the weakness and unsolidity of the Protestant Church, he pretends to disregard our efforts which have completely undermined it, and directs his attack on Catholic Tradition, as if to destroy a pillar of our church, could serve to bolster up and consolidate his own. Hence, taking the divine authority of the scriptures as fully established in his system, he coolly attempts to prove 'the sufficiency of the scriptures' by scriptural texts, which he still adduces and interprets in his own way, after they have been shown to have no weight, and labours to subvert Tradition by Tradition itself, which he rejects as an authority!! But the *Advocate* cannot delude us, and he shall not impose upon the public. If the Bible, privately interpreted, is alone a sufficient rule of faith, the Bible, unassisted by tradition, ought itself to show that it is divinely-inspired and complete in its canon: that the translation used is genuine, and the private interpretation correct. We have called upon the *Advocate*, who rejects Tradition, to establish these points, which ought first to be solidly established, before the Bible can be admitted as the sole test of doctrine. Let him then assail, as much as he please, the authority of tradition, he will only excite in us a smile at his impotent and ill-directed attacks; because the more he tries to beat down and demolish the authority of tradition, the more incumbent upon him it is to prove, from scripture alone, the very points which we have called upon him to establish. In a word, either Catholic Tradition is deserving of full credit, or it is not. If it is, the *Advocate* must acknowledge his system ungrounded and false: if it is not, how can he prove that the Bible is the word of God? that he has the whole Bible, which he has not? that his translation is correct, which is incorrect? that his interpretation, differing from the ancient and Catholic one, is conformable to the interpretation delivered by the Apostles? These are the difficulties which the *Advocate* must first solve, before he can claim the right to dispute against us either with the scripture or the fathers. Conscious, however, of the strength and justice of our cause, we, on our part, pledge ourselves, according as we may find time, to meet every objection which he can fairly advance either against tradition or any other Catholic Dogma. But for the present, we deem it proper to make the *Advocate* feel sensibly the rotten and frail nature of the single prop on which his religion rests. Meanwhile, he is welcome, if he please, to violate THE GLORIOUS RIGHT OF GOSPEL-LIBERTY, by forcing his biblical notions on the notice of the public, and to use Tradition which he rejects, as an argument to destroy the authority of Tradition.

We must now hasten to fulfil our promise to PHILOBIBLOS, who, bolder than the *Advocate*, has attempted to prove the divine inspiration of the Scriptures. He pretends to establish it in the same manner as the Catholic does. For this purpose, he appeals to the miracles which are recorded in the bible, to the numerous great prophecies which it contains, to the millions of martyrs who have laid down their lives in vouching for its

truth, and lastly, to the divine seal which is visibly impressed upon it. But this is not the Catholic method. PHILOBIBLOS confounds the evidences of the truth of Christ's church, with the proofs of the divine inspiration of the scriptures. Yet, it is very amusing to observe the caution and anxiety, which PHILOBIBLOS, like the rest of his brethren, manifests to march alongside of a Catholic, when there is question of combating an infidel. Feeling the difficulty of overcoming this doughty antagonist, yet knowing that the Catholic church can lay him prostrate with ease, he is anxious to keep close to her in the contest that he may be protected by her shield. But PHILOBIBLOS, who thought to come under her protection, has unfortunately mistaken his way, and taken up a position, where he must maintain the contest by himself. Standing aloof, we will calmly watch the combat, and observe what success may crown the courage of PHILOBIBLOS.

To prove the divine inspiration of the scriptures, PHILOBIBLOS brings forward the authority, firstly of miracles, secondly of prophecies, thirdly of martyrs, and fourthly of the divine seal. What miracles, demands the infidel? Scriptural miracles, or miracles wrought after the Scripture was written? If you mean, as is probably the case, the scriptural miracles, how can they prove the divine inspiration of the Bible? The recital of them forms but a small part of the very book about which it is questioned, whether it be inspired. Am I to believe these miracles, because a book, said to be inspired, recounts them? But this is 'to beg the question'; because I wish to discover, whether the book itself be inspired. If the miracles be ever so true, it is no proof that the book which contains the account of them, was dictated by the spirit of God. For the scriptural miracles were not wrought to establish the divine inspiration either of the whole Scripture, or of any part of it—certainly not of that part which was written after the last miracle recorded in Scripture. How does the sun standing still at command of Joshua, or Lazarus raised to life by Jesus Christ, prove the divine inspiration—I do not say of the whole Bible history (this were monstrously absurd,)—but even of the particular parts where these facts are related? If, on the other hand, continues the infidel, you allude to miracles which are not scriptural, how do you know that they actually took place, but by tradition, which you reject? What miracle was ever expressly wrought to prove that the whole Bible is the word of God? Or at least what miracle was ever done to demonstrate (this is an essential point) that your Protestant translation is conformable to the original Scriptures? Besides, if miracles which are not scriptural are to be taken as authority, you must yield to the Catholic, who can adduce thousands of them, better authenticated than you can, to attest the truth of his doctrine. Do you expect to convince me by proofs which you yourself reject?

You appeal in the second place to the prophecies. But how can the prophecies, any more than the miracles, of Scripture, prove the divine inspiration of the Bible history, which contains them. Though themselves divinely inspired, they might be faithfully recorded in a history which is uninspired. But how can I judge from this Bible, which you put into my hands, whether the prophecies of it were not forged, after the events predicted actually took place? Like you, remember, I reject tradition. Let us keep to our sufficient rule, the Bible. Does the Bible anywhere assert that the prophecies were inspired? No. If such a passage exist, is that passage inspired? Nay more—does the Bible any where assert,

that the whole Bible is inspired? No! and if it did, such self-testimony could have no force. Thus then, PHILOBIBLOS, I confute you. You maintain, that nothing is to be believed but what is distinctly expressed in the Bible. Well! but the Bible no where, either distinctly or indistinctly, declares that the whole Bible is inspired. Therefore, mark PHILOBIBLOS, I am bound to believe that the Bible is *not inspired*. Infidel as I am, yet you see I am a good Protestant; for I act on the leading principle of Protestantism, which is to believe nothing but what is contained in the Bible.

To appeal to the testimony of the martyrs, which is your third proof, is to fly openly to tradition, which we both reject. Moreover, where did you learn that the martyrs shed their blood to vouch for the divine inspiration of the Scriptures? They died to attest their belief in 'the faith delivered to the saints,' not their belief expressly in the inspiration of the written Bible; not their belief surely in the inspiration of this your Protestant version. How did the martyrs know that the bible was inspired? From the bible itself? certainly not. By tradition from the Apostles? But tradition we both maintain to be an uncertain channel of truth; so that the martyrs, in laying down their lives for the divine inspiration of the Scriptures, do not afford, because they may have been deceived, a surer proof of it, than if you were to bend your neck to the axe for the same purpose.

Your fourth proof is drawn from 'the Divine Seal,' which you imagine is stamped on the bible. This is a pretty metaphor, which may amuse the fancy, but not satisfy the understanding. If God has fixed his stamp, it ought, undoubtedly, to be clear and distinct; but the misfortune is, that the impression is often so faint and dim, that the great Chiefs of the Reformation failed, in several instances, to discern it. Thus Luther rejected books which Calvin admitted, and Calvin struck out of his canon your favourite book of Revelations, which Luther considered as divine. The Church of England, differing in judgment from both, established its own Scriptural Canon. What more is necessary to show that 'the Divine Seal' is a delusive criterion whereby to judge of the inspiration of the Scripture?

It is in this manner that an Infidel would assuredly defeat PHILOBIBLOS; for there is no certain way of proving the divine inspiration of the Bible, but by Catholic Tradition. The chain of Tradition, like Jacob's ladder, is fastened at one end to heaven, and, with the other, it touches the earth. At the head of it stands Jesus Christ: Bishops and Fathers guard the steps, and the Catholic Church holds fast and secures the lower end; so that, whatever has been spoken by Jesus Christ, is safely transmitted down by the watchmen, who, at each step of the chain-ladder, bear witness to the truth. The unwritten Gospel-doctrine descended before the Scriptures, and with the Scriptures came the one Divine interpretation of them. The Reformers, rejecting the Church's Doctrine as well as her authority, go forth from her fold, taking the Bible with them, and saying, 'This is the word of God: we want no other guide; this is a sufficient rule.' But though they carry away the Bible, they cannot take with them the authority which proves it to be the word of God. Hence, when the infidel starts a doubt as to the divine truth of the Gospel, they are at a loss: for they have no chain-ladder of Tradition which unites them to heaven: they cannot have recourse to that of the Catholic Church, whose authority

they reject. What then can they do? Obligated to assume as true what they are unable to prove, they betray the unsound foundation of their Religion, and drive men, who think and reason, into the bosom of the old Catholic Church, which stands for ever unshaken on its solid rock.

We have said enough to prove the weakness of the *Advocate's* cause: it is now time to display the strength of our own. We will, in our next number, treat the subject of Tradition, and leave the *Advocate* in the midst of his difficulties.

A CLEAR EXPOSITION OF THE FOUR CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TRUE CHURCH.

(Continued from our last.)

Our Church is HOLY. After seeing the principal traits in the characters of the chief reformers, let us turn to our own church. Who then can reasonably speak against its sanctity? Would to Heaven, that our faith was perfectly observed, and there would be seen the revival of primitive Christianity. Then, Princes, your kingdoms would be secure from hostile aggressions without arms or safeguards; for our law forbids plots, rebellious, and the invasion of others dominions. Parents, your daughters would be protected without assistance, for our law prohibits incontinency. Your treasures, O rich! would be safe without lock and key, for our law forbids theft and robbery. Then we should not fear our enemies, for we are ordered to do good to them! we should not dread nightly assassins, for murders by our faith are prohibited.

All true, reply our heterodox brethren, but to what purpose proclaim the dictates of your faith, while the professors of it are perverse? Be it so. What then? Do they pretend to assail our religion? This directs all to sanctity; it deters from vice, by threatening an eternity of punishment; it invites to virtue, by promising an eternity of bliss. Do they mean to attack the Catholics? They are right. We should be ashamed of our conduct in general, seeing that our works correspond so ill to our belief. But let not our adversaries sound victory. 'If (we shall say to them with St. Chrysostome) we live well, it is our gain; if we teach well, it is your's. Receive then, what is your's, and discuss not what is another's. Is precious gold despised because of the vile clay mixed with it? Therefore, as the gold is picked out, and the clay is left behind, so do you receive our doctrine, and leave our morals.' Many Catholics: it is true, are perverse; but only those, who are anywise inclined to change their religion, and of those who do change, there is not one, who after doing so, amends his life. We have already seen what were the lives of the arch-apostates from Catholicism—Luther and Calvin; and as for the others, let us ask Erasmus, and he will tell us: 'I can show you multitudes, who are become far worse, than they were before. Their discourses are little else than calumnies against the priesthood. They have abolished confession, and few of them confess their sins even to God; they have abrogated fastings, and they wallow in sensuality.' And Luther himself acknowledges, in his discourse on the Gospel of the first Sunday of advent, that 'men are now more revengeful and avaricious, more immodest and undisciplined, and far worse than they were under the Papacy.' And when the same reformer was interrogated by the Duke of Saxony as to which of the two religions, in his

heart he considered the best, he replied, that *the Lutheran is the best for living, but the Catholic is the best for dying*. And is it not incontrovertible, that our heterodox brethren cannot boast of a single saint, of one whose virtues can stand the fathoming examination of such men as our *Avvocato del Diavolo*? Whereas we have persons of every class, who have shone forth most brilliantly in all their actions, and were venerated even on earth, by their countrymen, as servants of God. All the sovereign Pontiffs, who filled the chair of Peter during the first five centuries, with one or two exceptions, have merited that glorious appellation: and the vein of sanctity has not dried up in their successors: witness the Leos, the Gregorys, the Piuses, and the Bonifaces. Then what shall we say of the Doctors? A Jerome, an Augustine, an Ambrose, a Gregory, a Chrysostome, a Basil, a Bernard, a Thomas, a Bonaventure were all men of such distinguished piety and learning, that they have even won the admiration of those who impugn them.

We are aware that our separated brethren boast also of their heroes. But they shall blush at the comparison. Let but the lives of those be examined, who are enrolled in their martyrologies, and it will be discovered, that what St. Austin said of the Donatists is applicable to them: 'They lived as robbers, and they were honored as martyrs.' (*Epist. 68.*) There is not a historian who does not relate the tumult they excited, the rebellions they plotted, and the crimes—the enormous crimes—they committed, whence '*their death*,' as St. Cyprian said of the heretics of his time, '*was not the crown of their faith, but the penalty of their perfidy.*'

Take another instance in addition to those already given. Take the saintly Cranmer, whose character we shall not attempt to describe as a Protestant; the truth-telling Cobbett, has done it before us. In his *History of the Protestant Reformation*, he thus writes:—

'Black as many others are, they black the moment, that Cranmer appears in his true colours. But alas! where is the pen or tongue to give us those colours? Of the 65 years that he lived, and of the 35 years of his manhood, 27 were spent in the commission of a series of acts, which for wickedness in their nature, and for mischief in their consequences, are absolutely without any thing approaching to a parallel in the annals of human infamy. Being a fellow of a college at Cambridge, and having of course made an engagement (as the fellows do to *this day*) not to marry while he was a fellow, he married *secretly*, and still enjoyed his fellowship. While a married man, he became a priest, and took the *oath of celibacy*; and going to Germany, he *married another wife*, the daughter of a Protestant; so that he had now *two wives* at one time, though his *oath* bound him to have *no wife at all*. He, as Archbishop, enforced the law of celibacy, while he himself secretly kept his German *frau* in the palace at Canterbury, having, as we have seen in par. 104, imported her in a *chest*. He, as ecclesiastical judge, divorced Henry VIII. from *three wives*, the grounds of his decision in two of the cases being directly the contrary of those, which he himself had laid down, when he *declared the marriages to be valid*; and in the case of ANNE BOLEYN, he, as ecclesiastical judge, pronounced, that ANNE *had never been the king's wife*; while as a member of the House of Peers, he voted for her death, as having been an *adulteress*, and thereby guilty of *treason* to her husband. As Archbishop under Henry (which office he entered upon with a premeditated false oath upon his lips) he sent men and women to the stake, because they were *not Catholics*, and he sent Catholics to the stake, because they would not acknowledge the king's supremacy, and thereby perjure themselves as he had so often done. Became openly a Protestant in Edward's reign and openly professing those very principles, for the professing of which he had burnt others. He now burnt his fellow-

Protestants, because their grounds for protesting were *different from his*. As executor of the will of his old master Henry, which gave the crown (after Edward) to his daughters Mary and Elizabeth; he conspired to rob those two daughters of their right, and to give the crown to Lady JANE GREY, that Queen of nine days, whom he, with others, ordered to be proclaimed. Confined, notwithstanding his many monstrous crimes, merely to the palace at Lambeth, he, in requital of the Queen's lenity, plotted with traitors in the pay of France to overset her government. Brought at last to trial, and to condemnation as a heretic, he professed himself ready to *recant*. He was respited for six weeks, during which time he signed six different forms of recantation, each more ample than the former. He declared that the Protestant religion was *false*; that the Catholic religion was the *only true one*; that he now believed in all the doctrines of the Catholic Church; that he had been a horrid blasphemer against the sacrament; that he was unworthy of forgiveness; that he prayed the people, the Queen, and the Pope, to have pity on, and to pray for, his wretched soul; and that he had made and signed this declaration without fear; and without hope of favour, and for the discharge of his conscience, and as a warning to others. It was a question in the Queen's council, whether he should be pardoned, as other recanters had been; but it was resolved, that his crimes were so enormous, that it would be unjust to let him escape; to which might have been added, that it could have done the Catholic Church no honor to see reconciled to it a wretch covered with robberies, perjuries, treasons, and bloodshed. Brought therefore to the public reading of his recantation, on his way to the stake; seeing the pile ready; now *finding that he must die*, and carrying in his breast all his malignity undiminished, he *recanted his recantation, thrust into the fire the hand that had signed it*, and thus expired, protesting against that very religion, in which, *only nine hours before*, he had called God to witness that he firmly believed!

Now let us give a glance at *our martyrs*. If we examine their number of every rank, of every age, and of every sex, we shall find them to have amounted to several millions. If we look for their crime, which caused their death, we shall discover that it was only *our faith*, or some virtue taught by *our faith*. Our enemies themselves have acknowledged it: and Pliny among the rest, who had frequently investigated into the life of those heroes, candidly informed by letter the Emperor Trojan, that he did not discover any other crime in them than a *too great facility in offering themselves to martyrdom*. On the other hand, God fulminated awful scourges against their persecutors. Claudius Nero, with his son Britannicus, died from poison. Caligula, Domitius Nero, Otho, Domitian, Auzelius Commodus, and Pertinax were all murdered either by their own domestics, or by their soldiery. Of twenty-seven Emperors, who swayed the sceptre in the third century, when the persecution raged more violently than ever, one, Claudius, died of the plague; another, Carus, died from a thunderbolt; a third, Valerian, was flayed and salted alive by his enemies; Decius was drowned; Tacitus only reigned seven months; Diocletian in despair descended from the throne, and dragged along with him Maximian; all the other Emperors of that century were butchered either by themselves or by their own people. Thus while the tyrants foamed against the martyrs, God declared the innocence of the martyrs, by the punishment of the tyrants. Nay more. He even changed the laws of nature. He made their pains contribute to their triumph. The torturers often trembled at the sight of the torments they were inflicting, and the martyrs exulted at the thought of being tormented. He often quenched their flame, as in behalf of Lucy; he often healed their sores, as in the case of Margaret and Agatha: he visited others in prison, like a Cathe-

rine, and comforted others with angelical assistance, like a Vincent. At one time lions and tigers lost all their fierceness; at another the torturer's arms withered: at one, tyrants fell from their seats, at another, idols from their altars. In a word the judges, who had condemned them; the actors, who had derided them; the soldiers, who guarded them; the torturers, who tormented them; the people, who were spectators of their torments, often abjured their errors, and embraced the faith of those innocent victims of barbarity; nay more, often presented themselves simultaneously to martyrdom, and requested to be put to death.

Now it is undeniable, and has been frequently demonstrated, (though this is not the place to discuss it), that the faith of the Catholic Church of the present day, is identical with that for which those illustrious heroes laid down their lives. Who then will assert, that our Church is not *Holy*?

(To be continued.)

Selections.

LETTER OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF POSEN TO THE KING OF PRUSSIA.

(Translated from the *Augsburg Gazette* of the 6th and 7th of March, 1838.)

Most Serene and most Mighty King!
Most Gracious King and Lord!

I FEEL myself compelled to approach your Majesty, and to trouble your Majesty with my reflections on a subject respecting which I have not been able to obtain satisfaction from the Most Noble the Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs. I take this step with that reverence which will convince your Majesty of my most dutiful respect, and with all the confidence which the millions who are guarded by the Prussian sceptre must place in your justice and magnanimity. The subject to which I have alluded is that of mixed marriages, or of marriages between Catholics and persons who differ from them in religion. In my archdiocese the law which regulates these marriages is contained in a brief of Pope Benedict 14th, which was addressed to the Bishops of Poland, June 29th, 1748, and commences with these words: '*Megnæ nobis admirationis*;' according to which, and as had been declared by many more ancient statutes of the Catholic Church, mixed marriages are permitted only on certain conditions, which are, that the Catholic party shall exert all its power to lead the other party into the bosom of the Catholic Church, and that the children springing from such marriages shall all be instructed in the Catholic faith. This brief has not been annulled or modified by any later apostolical decree; it is still in all its force in those provinces which once formed Poland. But your Majesty's laws are not in unison with this decree. The common law of the land prescribes P. 2. Tit. 2, p. 76) that the sons shall follow the religion of the father, and that the daughters shall follow the religion of the mother. By a decree of your Majesty's most noble Council, dated Nov. 21, 1803, this law was changed. That decree provides that all the children shall follow the religion of their father, unless the parents shall mutually consent to the contrary. When the dukedom of Warsaw was instituted in 1807, this decree lost its power in those parts of the dioceses of Gnessen and Posen which were comprehended within the dukedom. The code Napoleon, which was then introduced, considered marriages only as civil contracts, and left the ecclesiastical solemniza-

tion of them to the consciences of the contracting parties. The Catholic priest was then bound by the above-mentioned brief of Pope Benedict 14th. In 1815, when possession of the province was regained, your Majesty, in your proclamation to the inhabitants of the dukedom declared, on the 15th May of the same year, 'YOUR RELIGION SHALL BE PRESERVED INVIO-LATE.' The meaning of these words must be, 'The Catholic Religion in this province shall continue in its original independence of faith and discipline under its visible Head the Pope; it shall continue uninjured and protected.' By sovereign letters patent of Nov. 9th, 1816, the common law of Prussia, with explanatory, changing and renewing clauses of March 1, 1817, was restored in Posen; and by letters of Sept. 24, 1834, the Chief President informed me that the Cabinet order of Nov. 21, 1803, regarding the education of the children of mixed marriages was again in force. It must be evident to every one that these repeated changes must necessarily cause great confusion and want of confidence amongst the Catholic clergy on the subject of mixed marriages, which indeed occur here very unfrequently. It has sometimes however, happened, that they have celebrated these marriages without the observance of the conditions imposed by the Church. In the mean time the brief of Pius VIII., dated March 25th, 1830, which marks out the duties of the priest in mixed marriages, and which was published by the Archbishop of Cologne and his suffragans the Bishop of Triers, Munster, and Paderborn, became known through the public prints. This document demonstrated also to the clergy of my archdiocese that preceding regulations regarding mixed marriages had in nowise been changed by the Holy See; that a departure from them was a serious error—a great sin against God and his holy word—an injury to the immutable Catholic faith—in a word, that it placed in peril the eternal salvation of those Catholics who were therein concerned. The troubles of conscience that were consequently excited, and their duty to the highest authority, to their holy religion, caused my clergy to make to me many applications both in person and in writing—my own conscience and my jealousy for my faith, *from my integrity in which nothing on this earth shall cause me to swerve*—induced me to propose to your Majesty's Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs, 'That the above Brief should be officially published in my archdiocese, or that it should be permitted to me to submit my cause for determination to the Apostolic See.' Both parts of my proposition were rejected with a severity—yes, with personal insult of such a nature, that I could not have expected in my high public station, nor under your Majesty's powerful government—a government *by which freedom of conscience had been secured by law*, of which well nigh half of the subjects profess of the Catholic religion, in which all revere a Monarch who protects equally, without partiality or prejudice, the different faiths of his subjects.

Your Majesty's minister endeavours to justify his refusal by saying 1st, that the brief of Pius VIII., of March 25th, 1830, was directed only to the Archbishop of Cologne, and to the Bishops of Triers, Munster, and Paderborn, with whom my archdiocese has no connexion; 2nd, that prescription had in this archdiocese justified the practice of permitting mixed marriages without the exaction of any conditions by Catholic priests. Your Majesty will deign to allow me most humbly to remark that I, a Catholic Archbishop, cannot expect to be instructed in the signification and in the intent of briefs from the Holy See by a layman, a Protestant minister of state. I cannot in conscience concede to him the right of interpreting Apostolical decrees which regard our faith, which regard the sacerdotal administration of the Holy Sacraments, of which Matrimony is one. I have received from Catholic antiquity the rules by which I interpret these decrees. My conscience forbids me to admit any thing foreign therein. This ministerial mandate is like to one that would tell me that the Apostolical Epistles of the Blessed Paul to the Romans, Ephesians, Corinthians, &c. &c., were directed to them exclusively, and not to the whole of Christendom. The brief alluded to contains nothing new, it only repeats and confirms the ancient Catholic doctrine of mixed marriage; it ex-

tends therefore to the whole of the Catholic world. But I will suppose, for a moment, that the minister was correct in his statement; even then, in the place of this contested brief, there will enter the address of Leo 12th of the Calends, 8th January, 1825, directed to the Bishops of the Catholic world. This address lays down the same laws with regard to mixed marriages as those which are contained in the above-mentioned brief of Benedict 14th, and, by the force of Apostolical authority, commands entire obedience.

The universality of this address cannot be disputed; nor can we doubt of its acceptance by our Prussian government, which secures freedom of conscience in all things appertaining to religion.

To the second part of the minister's declaration, I say, that I have already explained how it has happened that sometimes mixed marriages have been solemnized without the requisite conditions. This is an abuse which has been occasioned by the many political changes to which we have been subjected. But the acts of the preceding century are pledges of the exactness with which the brief of Benedict 14th was then observed. A prescription such as that which your Majesty's minister would deduce from a dereliction of duty, is considered of no force by the Catholic Church. Errors, how long soever they may have been established, are to be eradicated immediately they are declared as such by the infallible oracles of our religion. It is thus with unconditional mixed marriages; they cannot be tolerated without an injury to our Catholic faith, nor without exposing to eternal ruin the souls of the parties; they ought not to be required by a government which has promised to protect the Catholic religion in all its purity.

I now most humbly solicit your Majesty's attention to the following consideration; the Holy See insists that the brief of Benedict 14th shall be strictly observed in my archdiocese in the solemnization of mixed marriages. As a proof of this I most respectfully adduce, 1st, the dispensation which was granted March 17, 1837, for the marriage of Marianna Okonierska, a Catholic, with Martin Coperowsky, an Evangelical; and 2nd, the letter of the chief president, of May 12th, of the same year. The dispensation contains the following express conditions:—'The Evangelical party shall consent that the children of both sexes that may be born shall be educated in the Catholic faith and he shall not impede the Catholic party in the free practise of her religion: this latter shall moreover endeavour to bring her husband within the bosom of the Catholic Church.' The rescript of the president requires on the other hand 'that whatever clauses may be contained in this dispensation contrary to the Prussian law shall be considered as not therein contained.' Your Majesty will be pleased to consider that a dispensation granted under certain conditions is of no avail unless those conditions be faithfully observed. Can you annul these conditions and still wish to profit by an useless dispensation! If the minister has discovered that there is any thing in the commands of the Holy See opposed to our laws, he should endeavour by diplomatic arrangements to bring both into harmony, not impose upon the Catholic clergy a restraint which must bring with it a violation of duty, an injury to religion, and which is a burden upon their consciences from which your Majesty's laws protect them. The ministry endeavours to force the Catholic clergy to the celebration of unconditional mixed marriages by a menace of severe measures. What has hitherto been done with regard to these marriages was done through error; to repeat what has been done would be highly sinful. It would seem impossible, therefore, that a conscientious ministry should wish the clergy to practise what they condemn—impossible that they should wish to prevent them from consulting in their difficulties their supreme head. This would be a severity destructive of all liberty of conscience. I must remark, though with the greatest respect, that I am not now speaking of the civil law, which considers marriage only as a civil contract, and which can so far interfere with it; but I am speaking of the sacerdotal solemnization of marriage, consequently of the administration of a Sacrament. Human laws depend upon the power and wisdom of the lawgiver.

This all confess; but the administration of the Holy Sacraments, and the determination when and under what conditions they shall be administered, depends solely upon the Church, and her chief pastors. This is an article of our religious belief, and without it our religion could not endure.

I cannot lay aside the persuasion that to insist upon the celebration of unconditional mixed marriages is essentially injurious. The Catholic mother who consents to the education of her children in a faith contrary to her own is either indifferent to religion or she is not. If she be indifferent, this spirit will increase in her intercourse with her Protestant husband, and in the education of her children this indifferentism will be introduced into matters of faith. She will thus educate libertines, who will corrupt all around them. The number of irreligious men will thus be increased, which I think no state or government can desire. But, if we suppose her to entertain a just sense of religion, what a pang must it cause her to live with a man who is opposed to her on subjects the most dear to her heart: what a violence and what disunion in her family to see her children imbibe a spirit so contrary to her own. Assuredly no friend to domestic society could wish to see this state of things. Again these marriages are not just; the party that is not Catholic obtains from the civil authority, for some trivial cause, a dissolution of the contract, and is perhaps married to another person; the Catholic is thus grievously injured, for, according to his belief, no valid marriage can be annulled: he must therefore suffer or renounce his religion, and this last step would sooner or later awaken his slumbering conscience and render him unhappy for ever. How much more happy are they who are united in religion as in matrimony, who rejoice and suffer together, who kneel at the same altar to return thanks to God for those consolations which religion imparts.

All these considerations lead me to the steps of your Majesty's most exalted throne, there most humbly to present my prayer that your Majesty would graciously grant your sanction that all future mixed marriages in my Archdiocese of Gnesen and Posen may be solemnized according to the rules laid down by Benedict XIV., in his brief to the Archbishops and Bishops of Poland, which begins with these words '*Magnæ nobis admirationis*,' and which I mentioned in the commencement of this letter. I pray that we may proceed for the future, as we have been before accustomed to act, without the intervention of the civil power; or that, to be relieved from the troubles of conscience which have afflicted me and the clergy subjected to me, we may apply to the Apostolic See in a manner that is consonant to our holy religion, to which I shall for ever remain faithful and true.

With the most sincere respect,

I am your Majesty's most humble servant,

† V. DUNIN.

ARCHBISHOP GNESSEN AND POSEN.

Posen, 26th Oct., 1837.

CLEMENT AUGUSTUS BARON VON DROSTE VISCHERING,
ARCHBISHOP OF COLOGNE.

The eyes of all Europe are turned to the fortress of Minden, into which this venerable and innocent victim of persecution has been cast, perhaps, to linger through the remaining years of his life. He has been followed into his dungeon by the triumphant shouts of the enemies of religion and morality. These cannot pain him, for the voice of the Chief Pastor, speaking from his high throne in the Vatican, has borne consolation to him; and the voice of his own conscience, which tells him, that he is a suffering martyr to his sacred duties, whispers to him joy and peace amidst the horrors of imprisonment.

We will give briefly the causes of this war of earthly powers against ecclesiastical right, as they have been detailed in authentic documents in Germany

and France. They may be reduced to two:—the controversies respecting the doctrines of Professor Hermes, and mixed marriages. The late Dr. Hermes, had for many years taught theology in the University of Bonn. It is not within our province to examine his system, in which we may however remark, that reason is considered as the only means by which we can arrive at a knowledge of supernatural truths. The system has been condemned by the Sovereign Pontiff as containing doctrines subversive of our faith, relative to the scriptures, to tradition, and to revelation; as containing errors with regard to the attributes of God, to the state of our first parents, to original sin, and to the powers of fallen man. These doctrines had seduced many of the professors at Bonn, and by their growth amongst the clergy, had become dangerous to Religion, when, at the instance of those who remained firm in the faith of the church, they were formally condemned by the Holy See, on the 26th of September, 1835, six months after the death of Monsig. Spiegel, the late Archbishop of Cologne. Archbishop Spiegel had been the protector of the followers of Professor Hermes, and we shall have soon to lament his pusillanimity in yielding to the threats or solicitations of the Court of Berlin in the transactions respecting mixed marriages, which have since called down the indignation of Prussia upon the head of his successor. No communication from Rome can pass to the Catholics of Prussia, which is not transmitted to them by the hand of a protestant minister of state. The condemnation of the work of Hermes, whose doctrines had been patronised by the ministers, could not therefore be expected to be published by them. They endeavoured to conceal it, but it was made known by the journals of the surrounding States. Hence arose a division amongst the Catholic theologians. Those who adhered to Hermes, persevered in their adherence; whilst his condemnation by the Holy See, although not formally promulgated in Prussia, was sufficient to determine the minds of the orthodox. In the mean time, the administrator of the arch-diocese of Cologne, published an address to the clergy, in which he declared that it was the duty of the faithful, to yield obedience to the decisions of the Apostolic See in all cases which regard the faith of the church, and, that this submission would be expected in the present case, if the prohibition of the censured works *should be promulgated*. Until this promulgation should take place, he forbade the clergy 'to speak of these questions, or even to allude to them in their exhortations, sermons, or catechisms.'

Such was the position of affairs when Monsig. Droste Vischering took possession of the archi-episcopal See of Cologne, in May, 1836. He found his diocese infected with errors, which had been examined and condemned by the highest tribunal. The partisans of these errors were in every part of the diocese subject to him: they formed part of his own chapter; his seminary, and the *convictorium* of Bonn, and many parishes, were under the guidance of men who publicly defended the proscribed doctrines of Hermes. What was then his duty as ecclesiastical superior, to whom the care of so many souls had been confided? To eradicate from amongst them dangerous errors which had taken deep root, and which every day acquired new strength and wider extent. He therefore drew up eighteen propositions, to which he required all his clergy to attach their signatures, or to resign their employments. Seventeen of these propositions contained the true Catholic faith; in opposition to as many of the condemned doctrines of Hermes. The eighteenth contained a declaration of faith, in the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, and of submission to his decisions in all things appertaining to discipline and faith. This mode of proceeding adopted by the archbishop, is in entire conformity with the practice of the Church on all occasions when truth has been attacked by error.

The Prussian minister, Altenstein, was however, deeply aggrieved by these propositions, particularly by the last, and spoke of it, in his accusation of the archbishop, as one of his greatest offences. To prevent the dissemination of the tenets of Hermes in the University of Bonn, the archbishop had to encounter many and great difficulties. The dismissal of the professors

was not in his power, and it would have been idle to have invoked the aid of the government.

He had recourse therefore to the only means which seemed to favour his views. The statutes of the University of Bonn, sanctioned the practice of Hermesians, requiring that the professors should submit the courses of lectures to be delivered by them in the schools, to the approbation of the Archbishop of Cologne. Of the courses contained in the first half-yearly programme presented to Archbishop Droste, only three received the necessary approbation. The programme was however, printed and circulated in the University, as if it had never been presented to the archbishop, or had been sanctioned by him. The excitement occasioned by this proceeding became so violent, that the commissary of the government at length interposed, and forbade the teaching of the doctrines of Hermes as well as all discussions on them. The submission that had been refused to the Church, was reluctantly given to the State. But by an absurd contradiction, the same commissary granted to H. Achterfeld, the superior of the *Convictorium* permission to adopt in his establishment any course of studies that to him might seem proper or convenient. H. Achterfeld, who had edited the posthumous works of Hermes, immediately marked out for his students the course that had been prohibited by the archbishop. Only eight of fifty students consented to obey; of the disobedient, some were expelled, the others followed them, rather than remain with burden on their conscience.

The conduct of the archbishop throughout this affair, must appear to every unprejudiced spectator, as the conduct of a virtuous pastor zealous for the welfare of the numerous flock entrusted to him. To what does this trust oblige him, if not to prevent the approach to his people, of errors destructive of that faith without which it is impossible to please God; or to banish it from them, if unhappily it has entered in? And yet, for this conscientious discharge of a most sacred duty, he is pronounced by a minister of state, as guilty 'of an audacious disdain of the laws and ordinances of the land; of a contempt of all prescribed forms; of a trespass upon the rights of the sovereign; of intolerable despotism.'

But the most violent collision was occasioned by the controversy respecting mixed marriages, or marriages of Catholics with Protestants. That the state had not the slightest authority to interfere with the Catholic church in this affair, and that it did so in violation of the liberty of the subject, has been proved by another illustrious confessor of the faith, the Archbishop of Posen, in his eloquent letter to the King of Prussia.* Before the publication of the Prussian code, the education of the children born from such marriages was left entirely to the discretion of the parents. This was found to be too favourable to Catholicity, and the following regulations were therefore promulgated:

'1. If the parents are members of different communions, the male children shall be educated until their fourteenth in the religion of their father, the females in the religion of their mother.

'2. Neither parent can oblige the other, even by contract, to depart from the provisions of the law.

'3. As long as the parents agree as to the religious education of their children, no third party can oppose them.'

These provisions were afterwards modified by a royal ordinance of November 21, 1803, which commanded that all children springing from mixed marriages *should be educated in the religion of the father*. On the 17th of August 1825, this ordinance was extended to the provinces of the Rhine and Westphalia. The Catholic priests had been accustomed to exact from the parties contracting mixed marriages, that all the children should be educated in the Catholic religion: this practise was now condemned as an abuse, and all parties who should not observe the royal ordinance, were to suffer the loss of their employments.

* Published in the *Orthodox Journal* for April 7, 1838.

As the priests continued to follow the discipline of the universal church, the government applied to the bishops to command the clergy to comply with the ordinances. They refused, and the Pope, Pius VIII, was solicited at the same time by the bishops and the king to issue definitive regulations. His brief is dated 25 March, 1830. His Holiness fearful, as he says, of rendering himself guilty of a great crime before God and the church, by seeming to co-operate in the sins of those who rashly expose themselves and their children to the loss of their souls by marriages in which Catholic parents permit their children to be educated in the Protestant religion, can permit no more than that the parish priest may, where it is necessary to prevent great injury to religion, ~~order~~ the marriage to be contracted in his presence, that he may afterwards ~~cancel~~ it upon his register.

Thus foiled in its attempts, the Prussian government again had recourse to concealment. The Brief of His Holiness was kept for years in the portfolio of the minister. A conference was held in 1834, between M. Bunsen, the Prussian minister at Rome, who was called from that city to meet Archbishop Spiegel at Coblenz. The result of their meeting was an instruction interpretative, according to their ideas, of the Papal Brief. Soon after a convention was concluded at Berlin with the same Archbishop, who was joined in a short time by the Bishops of Treves, Paderborn, and Munster. In this it was determined, that no promise should be exacted from either of the parents as to the education of their children; that the mere passive assistance permitted by the Pontiff at the marriage ceremony should be avoided as much as possible; and that in all other cases the ordinary ceremonies of the Church should be employed. The cause of religion was thus betrayed by the weakness of these bishops, and the brief of the Pope reduced to an empty sound. But Providence now interposed. Archbishop Spiegel did not long survive this convention, and Monsig. Droste was selected by the government as his successor. He was then Bishop of Calameta *in partibus*, and brother of the Bishop of Munster, who had signed the convention. The choice was extraordinary, for he had on previous occasions, while administrator of Munster shewn, a degree of firmness, a repetition of which could not be acceptable to the minister, Altenstein. He could not be required to conform to the convention, for it had been hitherto kept secret. The anxiety of the minister was considerable; he therefore, by the intervention of M. Schmulling, a canon of Munster, obtained from Monsig. Droste, a promise that he would accede to the convention, which had received the sanction of four bishops, *in all things that were in conformity with the brief of Pius VIII. dated March 25, 1830.* Such were the words of the interrogatory, and such the words of the reply.

As soon as the Archbishop entered his diocese, he began, as we have seen, to destroy the abuses that had grown up during the life time of this predecessor. His directions regarding mixed marriages were: that after three publications of the bans, if the contracting parties mutually agreed that the children should be baptized and educated in the Catholic faith, the marriage should proceed according to the rites of the church; if they do not agree, passive assistance, when necessary, might be permitted; but the Catholic mother, if she should consent that her children should be educated in any faith but her own, should be refused the rite of churching. This conduct irritated the government; threats and allurements were employed to shake the constancy of the Archbishop. He was informed by the minister, that if he would comply with the Government in its decrees relative to mixed marriages, the Government would oblige the clergy and professors to submit to the brief of the Pope, condemning the works of Hermes! But threats and allurements were in vain. The prelate was accused of a violation of his promise given before his appointment to the arch-diocese of Cologne. He answered, that he had promised to accede to the convention of Berlin, only as far as it was in conformity with the decree of the Pope. He cited letter of the Bishop of Trèves, addressed from his death-bed to the Pope: 'Now that a painful disease has placed me at

the entrance of the tomb, enlightened by divine grace, I see that these measures will produce consequences most fatal to the Catholic church, and that by them the canons of the church have been violated. I therefore, in sincere repentance, voluntarily revoke all my errors in this most important affair.' He was threatened with suspension from his ecclesiastical functions. He replied, 'That with regard to mixed marriages the Brief of His Holiness could be his only guide.' On the 4th of November of the last year, the Archbishop assembled his chapter and the clergy of Cologne. He communicated to them the demands of the government, and his own answers. Some of the canons received the information with cold indifference: others openly disapproved of the proceedings of their Archbishop. The parish priests, on the contrary, manifested their sympathy, and declared that they would remain faithful to their superior. He, foreseeing the storm that was preparing to burst upon him, sent copies of the letter of the minister and of his own answer, to all the Deans of his diocese, to justify himself against the accusations of the government.

The threats of the minister were quickly put in execution. The president of the regency of Aix-la-Chapelle arrived at Cologne, and summoned the Archbishop to conform to the wishes of the government, or to surrender himself as his prisoner. He was then ordered to leave the city: he replied, 'that he would surrender only to force.' Force was employed. In the evening, the square of St. Gereon, before the episcopal palace, was filled with armed soldiers; the president of the Rhenish provinces, accompanied by the president of the regency of Aix-la-Chapelle, entered the palace, and the Archbishop, whose only offence had been the conscientious discharge of his high duties, was commanded to obey the king or to resign his dignity. Upon his refusal he was ordered to prepare for his departure, together with M. Michaelis, his secretary. He was conveyed immediately to the fortress of Minden, in Westphalia, where he still remains, 'not as a prisoner,' says the Official Gazette of Berlin, 'for he may leave it when he pleases, provided that he will pledge his word of honour not to exercise any of his archi-episcopal functions.'

Prussia has endeavoured to justify these violent and unjust proceedings, in an official exposition of facts: how ill it has succeeded has been shewn by the Court of Rome in a counter exposition, as remarkable for its veracity as for its firmness and moderation.

The King of Prussia may imprison the venerable archbishops of the church, he can never confine or enthrall the spirit of the church. It is an institution not of earth but of heaven, and shall be defended against the powers of this earth, unto the consummation of time by him who has said, 'my kingdom is not of this world.'

We will conclude in the words of a writer in the *Université Catholique*: 'Far from lamenting the captivity of the Archbishop, we consider it a blessing to him and to the church. What has the church at any time lost by persecution? Fear not: the chains, which have been thrown over her and which she has broken, have always been her most precious adornments, nor shall it be that the chains of her present persecutors shall reduce her to an eternal bondage.'*

* See the *Université Catholique*: and the eloquent work of Görres, entitled *Athanasius*.

Intelligence.

(From the Catholic Magazine, for May 1839.)

LYME REGIS.—This mission, which had been abandoned for a time, has been resumed, under the pastoral charge of the Rev. Mr. Vaughan. A chapel was built about two years ago; the congregation, though small, is on the increase, and will serve as a nucleus for the extension of religion in the adjoining part of Dorsetshire. Catholic families, who have hitherto been prevented, by the want of a chapel, from resorting to Lyme during the bathing season, will now find a commodious place of worship; and by repairing thither, may contribute to give permanency to this new and important mission.

FLOWERS FROM THE HOLY FATHERS.

No. IX.

‘Perit omne quod agitur si non humilitate custoditur. Hoc autem proprium esse speciem Electorum solet, quod de se semper sentiunt infra quam sunt. Humilitas magistra est omnium materque virtutum.’—*Sit. Georgii Magni Tom. 2. l. 23. Moral. c. 7. et. lib. 34. 17.*

LET every word, and deed, and thought,

Be leavened by humility—

Whate'er the lure—receive it not—

If it should come with aspect high—

Although with seeming good 'tis fraught—

Bid the uncouth temptation fly.

There is no good—no dew of grace,

No leaven there of Heaven's love,

Where every act bears not the trace,

Where every gesture does not prove

How much the mind in every place

With sweet Humility is wove.

Though high heroic Love be thine,

Kept not by her, 'tis lost, how soon,

Though seeming bright thy virtue shine,

Clouds shall o'ercast thy garish noon,

Still varying with sure decline,

And waning like the inconstant moon.

With her, thy birthright, heavenly fair,

Bathes in a sure and bright aspect,

She bids unseemly Pride beware—

Reins in the champing intellect—

But better far, she makes thee heir

To endless joys, that wait th' elect.

Of every Virtue, Mistress, Queen,

She guides, she guards, she leads thy way,

She will provide thee pastures green,

Where dangers never come to fray;

And having lived and loved unseen,

Shall lead thee to Eternal Day.

Printed by Messrs. W. Rushton and Co., Calcutta, for the Proprietors, price one rupee per month, or ten rupees per annum in advance. To non-subscribers 8 annas per number.

THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

'One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.'

No. XVI.

OCTOBER 19, 1839.

VOL. I.

VISION OF THE BRIDGE OF TRADITION.

As we were yesterday evening contemplating the subject of Tradition, which in our last number we promised to discuss, we fell into a train of pleasing reflections, which so completely engaged and beguiled the mind, that one hour imperceptibly stole away after another, until darkness had settled round us. We rose from our editorial chair; but oppressed by the sultry heat of the evening, and weary with long-continued study, which, while it fascinated the mind, had unconsciously exhausted the frame, we threw ourselves on a couch and soon fell into a profound sleep. As our eyelids yielded to its gentle pressure, the thoughts, which during the evening had occupied our mind, still hovered around it, and fancy, disengaged from the stern control of the judgment, now began to sport wildly at her will, combining our floating ideas into distinct forms of imagery, and giving them the most vivid and glowing colours.

Methought I was transported to a vast plain, where I could not discover, as I wished, any road which led to the temple of Truth. Bewildered among the intricate paths which continually crossed each other, I had well nigh given up the search in despair, when, startled by the sound of a voice which called me by my name, I turned round, and beheld a venerable old man, whose white beard hung on his chest, beckoning for me to approach him. Encouraged by the gentle tones of his voice, and the affability of his looks, I obeyed him. 'You are seeking, young man, for truth,' said he, 'in this wide world where you have no guide: follow me.' He led me in silence to the top of a hill, not far off, which rose with a gentle acclivity from the midst of the level country around. As soon as I reached the summit, I saw rolling through the plain a broad and rapid river, which at both ends seemed lost as it were in an ocean. Nearly opposite to the place where we stood, there was an immense bridge thrown over the river, and composed of a great number of vast and massive arches. The last arch on this side was unfinished, but a countless multitude of men were labouring to complete it. 'What is this,' said I, turning to my aged companion, 'which I see before me?' 'The river you

behold,' said he, 'is the great stream of time flowing between us and Jesus Christ, and the bridge, which spans it, is the wondrous bridge of Catholic Tradition. It is composed of eighteen immense arches, which, springing from a bed of solid rock beneath, bid defiance to the ravages of the destructive flood. The nineteenth arch, you see, is yet unfinished ; but in proportion as the rapid stream washes away its bank on this side, and continues to widen its channel, the Catholic Church of the present age gradually goes on with the arch, employing her sons of every nation and clime, for the completion of the work. Lo ! the bridge presents one unbroken line of arches, which, matchless in strength, perfect in symmetry, uniform in design, seem to be the work, not of a succession of artificers, but of one great master-mind, who at once struck out the plan and executed it. Though built, by distinct races of workmen, and at distinct but uninterrupted periods of time, yet it has been formed throughout on one plan ; the same, which the divine founder, at the out-set, explained by word of mouth to his Apostles, who in their turn taught it to their successors, leaving the grand outlines of it traced in a book, called the Bible. The written plan was well understood by the workmen of the second arch, who had laboured with the Apostolic workmen in the building of the first. Hence, whilst the written rule and the precise meaning of it were carefully handed down, whilst a large portion of those, who toiled at one arch, had been engaged in the formation of the one before it, no strange and novel method could be introduced without exciting an outcry from every quarter, '*This is not the old method of building used by our predecessors ; this is contrary to the rule which we have learnt.*' Mark you, not that the beautiful and imperishable marbles, of which the bridge is wrought, are every where the same ? See ! They are not taken from the nearest bank, where the workmen are toiling at the unfinished arch, but, hewn out of a divine quarry on the other, they are handed to them by their immediate predecessors of the eighteenth arch, who received their materials from those of the seventeenth, in the same manner as those of the second arch procured theirs from the Apostolic workmen of the first.—But let us descend, and take a close survey of the particular parts of that which as a whole has filled you with so much admiration at a distance.'

'There is nothing, in the building of the bridge,' said I, as we descended, 'which surprises me so much, as that so many millions of human beings, different in customs, character, language, and nation, should agree together in acting with such union precisely on the same rule.' 'You aim rightly,' said my conductor. 'As this naturally is beyond the power of man, it is an evident proof that the workmen, at every part of each successive arch, are under the guidance of Divine Truth, whose spirit is unity and peace. Hence the Catholic Bridge is not a human but a divine work. For when its founder Jesus Christ, in laying the first stone, showed his Apostles how to build, and ordered them to teach the same method to their descendants, he promised, that his spirit should remain with them for ever, and that arch after arch should spring from the deep bed of rock, as long as the stream of Time should roll on, wearing away the bank of human life.' We had now reached the outskirts of the immense body of men who belonged to the Catholic Bridge ; and passing through great numbers of idlers, who,

while they claimed the name of Catholic, engaged not in the work, we pressed forward to the scene of active exertion. Everything which I saw, filled me with wonder and delight; the present arch rising exactly similar to the last; the materials conveyed from the opposite bank through the uninterrupted line of men, who having been the workmen, were now the watchmen of their respective arches; the marbles hewn, polished, and laid by the same rule, and conformably to the same principles; the golden and richly ornamented conduit-pipe, which, springing from the rock of Christ, and running along the centre of the Bridge, rose in a Fountain where we stood, and from seven mouths poured forth its life-giving waters to the parched and weary labourers; the dignity and authority of the divinely constituted superintendents and subordinate officers, who, whilst they held the written rule in their hands, gave their directions according to the universal interpretation handed down and received: the order, peace, harmony, and charity amongst the common workmen, who deemed it best to obey their superiors in humility, than arrogantly to judge for themselves;—all this afforded me so much pleasure that I could not satisfy myself in beholding it.

‘But who,’ said I, addressing my aged friend, ‘is that grave and holy personage seated yonder on a lowly throne, and surrounded by a dignified council?’ ‘He,’ replied my conductor, ‘is the present Chief Head of the Catholic Body, over which he holds supreme power and jurisdiction, derived from Jesus Christ through an uninterrupted line of ancestors. It is his province to preside over all, to correct abuses, to preserve the bond of unity and peace, to decide on every question that is referred to his authority. Him all must obey. His name is — But mark,’ said he, suddenly interrupting himself, ‘what is going forward yonder.’ Looking to the place which he pointed out with his finger, I observed a tumult amongst some Catholic workmen, who refused, as I soon learnt, to submit to the authority of a Superintendent appointed to govern them. The case was referred to the Chief Head, who, after mature deliberation, condemned the refractory members, and threatened, if they persisted in their insubordination, to expel them as outcasts from the Catholic Body.

Whilst I was commiserating the fate of these unhappy men, and wondering how they could prize so little the happiness and honour of being engaged in so glorious and divine a work, I felt my shoulder gently touched by my guide, who made a motion for me to accompany him, as he walked up the Bridge. I followed him with panting delight. The road seemed a plain, great in width, and almost interminable in length. It was firm, solid, unshaken as a rock: there was not a fissure or opening any where to be seen: nor could I fancy that a deep and mighty stream was flowing beneath me, until my guide had drawn me to the balustrade which defended the sides of the Bridge.

‘Look!’ said my guide. Leaning over the fencework, I saw the broad river rolling onwards to the sea of Eternity; the mists, which arose, obscuring objects in the distance: the perishable things of life, which, like bubbles, floated along the dark surface of the stream: and I heard the loud roar of the waters as they gushed under the archway, and lashed indignantly, but in vain, the unshaken and unworn marble-rocks of the base. ‘But what,’ said I, ‘are those broken, misshapen dilapidated arches, which, at an equal distance from this Bridge of Catholic Tradition, stretch here

and there, at wide intervals, across the stream? Are they the ruins of some former bridge, which the flood has nearly washed away?' 'They form,' he replied, 'what you may call the BRIDGE OF HERESY: though in fact they never were a bridge, but unconnected arches, raised by men who at different periods rebelled against the Chief Head of the Catholic Bridge, and chose to build for themselves after their own fancy. There were, as we know from tradition, independent builders during the erection of the three first Catholic arches; but their labours have long since been swept away by the flood. You may still see some monuments of the pride and folly of Arius, Macedonius, Nestorius Eutiches and Pelagius, who from the 4th to the 7th arch built independently of the Catholic directors as well as of each other. The remains of their works at this distance appear like clusters of rocks rising out of the river. Opposite to the twelfth arch you may descry some ruins of half arches, which are said to have been raised by the Lollards, Waldenses, and Albigenes. They have almost sunk beneath the waters of Time. As my guide was yet speaking, my attention was directed to a three-arch bridge, which, beginning at the sixteenth arch of the Catholic Bridge, and running parallel with it to the bank of human life, appeared nothing more than a mass of various unhewn rocks, thrown loosely and ill-cemented together, without beauty, without order, without proportion, without strength. The foundations were so ill laid, that I wondered how it could stand a day against the rapid force of the current. As I was looking with astonishment at this folly of human pride, and observing the confusion and uproar which prevailed amongst the workmen employed at the last half-finished arch of it, 'That Bridge,' said my guide, 'which so strongly fixes your attention, is the Reformation Bridge. Come along with me, and you shall inspect it closely.' As soon as we had worked our way through the immense crowd which formed the Catholic body, we walked down the bank of the stream, until we reached the place where the workmen were erecting the Reformation Bridge. Nothing could exceed my surprise more than to find, that what, at a distance, had seemed one broad bridge, was a collection of a thousand narrow bridges running close alongside of each other. Each one had its own particular name; for each one differed not only from every other in its general features, but often from itself, the same parts being variously worked. I was not surprised at this, when I observed, that every workman had a copy of the RULE-BOOK in his hand, judging for himself as he shaped the block of stone, or laid it down in its place. It was a scene of confusion. Here, some dressed like officers, and wishing to claim authority, could not exert it, because they admitted every man's right to judge for himself. There, others, as they pleased, were seen hurrying to and fro, and conveying, from a quarry on the near bank, blocks of rough stone, very unlike the pure marble, which Catholics procured from the opposite bank. As I was very desirous to go on one of these narrow Bridges, my guide conducted me to the Anglican Bridge, which appeared stronger and more regularly built than the rest; but told me to be cautious how I walked, as there were a number of large crevices through which I might slip down into the stream. I reached in safety the extreme verge of the Bridge. Here I stood for a time, gazing with admiration at the Catholic Bridge of Tradition, stretching in all its strength, beauty, grandeur, and majesty across the full breadth of the stream. Turning round at length to thank my aged

guide for his goodness in having brought me to this glorious spectacle, I found he was gone. I began to retrace my steps, when two persons, of a devout cast of features, and with a canting tone of voice, came up to me, and presented to me a rule book, assuring me that it came straight to them from Jesus Christ. 'Indeed!' said I, looking at the opposite bank, and then at the broken arch on which I stood, 'indeed!' I was about to urge the point with them, when the stream, dashing with great force against the Bridge, made it shake to its foundations. Struggling in my fright to save myself, I sprang on my legs awake, and found myself standing, not on the reformation Bridge, but near my couch from which I had just fallen.

As soon as the letter, addressed by the Sacred Congregation to the Vicar Apostolic of Bengal, had been read in the church, we ordered some copies of it to be struck off at our own expense, that we might have the pleasure to present one to each of our Subscribers. They will perceive the deep regret of the Holy Father to find, that, after his repeated warnings, there should still be, in this country, sons of the Church who resist her authority. She cannot harbour disobedient children in her bosom. Unable therefore to consult the tenderness of a Father's feelings, the Chief Pastor has a stern duty which he MUST perform. He now threatens to cast out from her fold, not only the Priests, but the Laymen who disobey her mandates. The next letter ——— But God forbid! whoever tenders his salvation, or glories in being a member of the True Church, will never, in his own person, let her enemies see, how she purges off the dross, to preserve her purity and brightness.

REVD. MR. NOWLAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—Having seen some time since an exulting article in a nameless periodical of this city on the 'conversion' as it was styled, and fortunate death of the Revd. Mr. Nowlan, formerly a Catholic Priest, I beg to submit for insertion in your paper an authentic account of his apostacy from the faith of his forefathers, which has been furnished me by a learned gentleman, who arrived in India a few months back. Let the writer of the contrary article refute it if he can.

Yours obediently,

ANTI-FALSIFICATION.

'The unfortunate apostate Nowlan studied for some time in Maynooth. THE GENERAL IRREGULARITY AND LAXITY of his conduct caused his superiors to refuse to promote him to Orders, and he was accordingly dismissed in this state from the College. During his retirement in the country, he affected to be very penitent for his past conduct, and he thus made so favorable an impression on the minds of some of the clergy who were acquainted with him, that they interfered in his behalf with the Bishop, and he was unhappily ordained priest. Soon after his ordination, he made himself conspicuous as an ardent politician, and attended the po-

litical meetings, that were convened in his vicinity. He soon began to neglect the duties of his sacred calling, and in a short time this neglect became so notorious, that his Bishop found it necessary to place him under canonical suspension. Unable to bear with becoming humility this indispensable severity of his superior, he applied to Dr. Whately the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, to be received as an officiating clergyman into the Established Church. The Archbishop refused to receive him in this capacity. He then induced some bigots who exulted at his apostacy,* to interfere in his favor with some other Protestant dignitary, and after some time he got some sort of employment in the established church. What the nature exactly of this appointment was I do not know. But as I understand that suspended Catholic priests are not allowed by some recent regulation to be received as officiating ministers I do not think that his appointment was to any fixed curacy. In truth he appears to have been employed by some bigoted dignitary, more for the purpose of insulting the Church he had abandoned, than for the discharge of any clerical duty. He was accordingly sent round the country to pour forth unmeasured abuse of the catholic religion and its ministers. The respectable portion of the Protestant community soon learned his true history and his real character, and accordingly paid no attention to him. Before I left Ireland I heard that the unhappy man lay dangerously ill, and the *prevailing* report was, that his illness was brought on by the unfortunate propensity to drinking, which he had acquired *since* his apostacy†.

THE AUTHORS, AND FOUNDERS, OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

Its chief Apostle, Cranmer.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—On looking over the last number of the *Catholic Expositor*. I find that a typographical error, in the first sentence of your quotation from Cobbett's History of the Protestant Reformation, has escaped your vigilance. Instead of 'Black as many others are, they bleach the moment that Cranmer appears in his true colours,' you have it 'Black as many others are, they black, &c.' This repetition of *black* for *bleach*, completely destroys the meaning of the sentence.

While on the subject, Mr. Editor, I beg to observe that Cobbett was by no means singular in his opinion of Cranmer's character. The enlightened and candid writers of the *Edinburgh Review*, speaking of the great founders of the Church of England, describes them thus :—

'They were—a king, whose character may be best described, by saying, that he was despotism itself personified; unprincipled ministers; a rapacious aristocracy; a servile parliament. Such were the instruments by which England was delivered from the yoke of Rome. The work, which had been begun by Henry, the murderer of his wives, was continued by Somerset, the murderer of his brother: and completed by Elizabeth, the murderer of her guest. Sprung from brutal passion; nurtured by selfish policy,—the

* NOTE. Like our Calcutta friends in the journal above-mentioned. A. P.

† NOTE. What a glorious effect of embracing the *reformed* religion, mark it! A. P.

Reformation in England displayed little of what had, in other countries, distinguished it,—unflinching and unsparing devotion, boldness of speech, and singleness of eye. Of those who had any important share in bringing the alteration about, the excellent Ridley was perhaps the only person who did not consider it as a mere political job. Even Ridley did not play a very prominent part. Among the statesmen and prelates, who principally gave the tone to the religious changes, there is one, and only one, whose conduct partiality itself can attribute to any other than interested motives. We need not say that we speak of Cranmer.

‘If we consider Cranmer merely as a statesman, he will not appear a much worse man than Wolsey, Gardener Cromwell, or Somerset; but, when an attempt is made to set him up as a saint, it is scarcely possible for any man of sense, who knows the history of the times well, to preserve his gravity. The shameful origin of his history, common enough in the scandalous chronicles of courts, seems strangely out of place in a hagiology. Cranmer rose into favour by serving Henry in the disgraceful affair of his first divorce. He promoted the marriage of Anne Boleyn with the king. On a frivolous pretence, he pronounced it null and void. On a pretence, if possible, still more frivolous, he dissolved the ties which bound the shameless tyrant to Anne of Cleves. He attached himself to Cromwell, while the fortunes of Cromwell flourished; he voted for cutting off his head without a trial, when the tide of royal favour turned. He conformed backwards and forwards, as the king changed his mind. While Henry lived, he assisted in condemning to the flames those who denied the doctrine of transubstantiation; when Henry died, he found out that the doctrine was false. He was, however, not at a loss for people to burn. The authority of his station and of his grey hairs, was employed to overcome the disgust, with which an intelligent and virtuous child regarded persecution.

‘Intolerance is always bad; but the sanguinary intolerance of a man who thus wavered in his creed, excites a loathing to which it is difficult to give vent, without calling foul names. Equally false to political and to religious obligations, he was first the tool of Somerset, and then the tool of Northumberland. When the former wished to put his own brother to death, without even the form of a trial, he found a ready instrument in Cranmer. In spite of the canon law, which forbade a churchman to take any part in matters of blood, the archbishop signed the warrant for the atrocious sentence. When Somerset had been, in his turn, destroyed, his destroyer received the support of Cranmer in his attempt to change the course of the succession.

‘The apology made for him by his admirers, only renders his conduct more contemptible. He complied; it is said, against his better judgment, because he could not resist the entreaties of Edward! A holy prelate of sixty, one would think, might be better employed by the bedside of a dying child, than in committing crimes at the request of his disciple. If he had shown half as much firmness when Edward requested him not to commit murder, he might have saved the country from one of the greatest misfortunes that it ever underwent. He became, from whatever motive, the accomplice of the worthless Dudley. The virtuous scruples of another young and amiable mind were to be overcome. As Edward had been forced into persecution, Jane was to be seduced into usurpation. No transaction in our annals is more unjustifiable than this. To the part which Cranmer, and unfortunately some better men than Cranmer, took in this most reprehensible scheme, much of the severity with which Protestants were afterwards treated, must, in fairness, be ascribed.

‘The plot failed, popery triumphed, and Cranmer recanted. Most people look upon his recantation as a single blemish on an honorable life,—the frailty of an unguarded moment. But, in fact, it was in strict accordance with the system on which he had constantly acted. It was a part of a regular habit. It was not the first recantation that he had made; and in

all probability, if it had answered his purpose, it would not have been the last. We do not blame him for not choosing to be burnt alive. It is no very severe reproach to any person, that he does not possess heroic fortitude. But, surely, a man who liked the fire so little, should have had some sympathy for others. A persecutor who inflicts nothing which he is not ready to endure, deserves some respect; but, when a man who loves his doctrines more than the lives of his neighbours, loves his own little finger better than his doctrines, a very simple argument, *a fortiori*, will enable us to estimate the amount of his benevolence.

‘But his martyrdom, it is said, redeemed every thing. It is extraordinary, that so much ignorance should exist on this subject. The fact is, that if a martyr be a man who chooses to die rather than renounce his opinions, Cranmer was no more a martyr than Dr. Dodd. He died, solely because he could not help it. He never retracted his recantation, till he found he had made it in vain. If Mary had suffered him to live, we suspect that he would have heard Mass, and received absolution, like a good Catholic, till the accession of Elizabeth; and that he would then have purchased, by another apostacy, the power of burning men better and braver than himself.

‘We do not mean to represent him, however, as a monster of wickedness. He was not wantonly cruel or treacherous. He was merely a supple timid, interested courtier, in times of frequent and violent change.’

‘Somerset, with as little principle as his coadjutor had a firmer and more commanding mind. Of Henry, an orthodox Catholic, excepting that he chose to be his own pope,—and of Elizabeth, who certainly had no objection to the theology of Rome, we need say nothing. But, these four persons were the great authors of the English Reformation. Three of them had a direct interest in the extension of the royal prerogative: the fourth was the ready tool of any who could frighten him. It is not difficult to see from what motives, and on what plan, such persons would be inclined to remodel the church. The scheme was merely to rob the Babylonian enchantress of her ornaments, in order to transfer the full cup of her sorceries to other hands,—spilling as little as possible by the way. The principal founders of the church of England were mere politicians.’ For a continuation of the subject, see the review of Mr. Hallam’s *Constitutional History*.*

A. B.

Selections.

BIOGRAPHICAL ACCOUNT

Of the Venerable and Right Reverend DOCTOR CHALLONER, Bishop of Debba, and Vicar Apostolic of the London District.

* DOCTOR RICHARD CHALLONER was born at Lewes, in Sussex, on the 29th of September 1691. Both his father and mother were Protestants, and caused their son to be baptized in that persuasion. His father dying soon afterwards, Divine Providence conducted him, while yet very young, to Mr. Gother, the learned and pious Chaplain of Workworth, in Northamptonshire, by whom he was instructed in the principles of the Catholic Religion. He always professed the greatest esteem for Mr. Gother, mentioned his writings with praise, and earnestly recommended the perusal of them, both to the Clergy and Laity.

Soon after he had attained the 12th year of his age, he was sent, in 1704, to the College of the English Secular Clergy, in the University of Doway.*

* Doway Collage was founded by Cardinal Allen, in the year 1568.

This was done by the direction of Mr. Gother, who had observed in his pupil a great disposition for learning, great application, great modesty, great piety, and a strong inclination to dedicate himself to the service of God in the sacred ministry. Throughout the whole course of his studies, Mr. Challoner's conduct was most exemplary, and gained him the esteem of his masters, and the regard of his companions. When he reached the higher schools, he was considered one of the brightest ornaments of the house. In the schools in which the Belles Lettres were taught, he paid particular attention to the Greek writers, and even in his latest years, he frequently quoted the Greek poets with accuracy and pleasure.

After Mr. Challoner had completed his course of study, he was appointed Professor of Poetry, and afterwards of Rhetoric, and, on the 6th of September, 1713, was chosen Professor of Philosophy; but several years before this time, he had dedicated himself to the sacred ministry, by taking the oath, by which the matriculation of the junior Fellows of the English College at Doway was effected. By this oath, they bound themselves to the service of God, in the English Mission. Mr. Challoner was ordained Priest on the 26th of March, 1716. In July, 1718, he was promoted to the Chair of Divinity, and in 1719, he passed Bachelor and Licentiate of Divinity. The Diary of the College states, that he was received with great and universal applause.

Upon the resignation of Mr. Dickonson, in July 1720, Dr. Challoner was appointed to the Vice-Presidency of the College; but he still continued to teach Divinity. A great proportion of the members of the College were his penitents; he had besides many in the town, and among the Irish soldiers in the pay of France, with whom the wars, at that time, filled the hospitals of Doway and the adjacent towns. To all he administered the comforts of religion, and made the most active exertions to procure for them every other succour, of which they stood in need. It excited general surprise that one man should suffice for so much occupation. This was increased by the disastrous battle of Fontenoy. Many soldiers of the English army were taken prisoners, and several of these were Catholics. Dr. Challoner's charitable exertions extended to all, according to their necessities. While the Duke of Cumberland was advancing in his career of victory, he spoke unkindly of Doway College, and used threatening words; but when after his defeat, he was informed of the exertions of charity, which we have mentioned, he altered his tone; he acknowledged them with praise and gratitude, and on some occasions, proved himself, as far as the Penal Laws allowed, a friend to the members of the College.

After discharging the office of vice-President during ten years, Dr. Challoner was sent on the English Mission. In his Professorship of Divinity, he was succeeded by Mr. Alban Butler. There is reason to suppose that his stay in Doway College was protracted, merely in obedience to the will of his Superiors, his own inclination always leading him to the active exercise of Missionary duty.

From his arrival in London, till he was consecrated Bishop Dr. Challoner was a perfect model of a missionary Priest. He avoided more intercourse with the world than was necessary; he was most assiduous in the discharge of all his functions, and gave what these did not employ of his time, to prayer, to meditation, and to study. He rose at six o'clock in the morning, said his morning prayer, and made an hour's meditation; he seldom omitted to say Mass; he said the office of the Church, as far as his employments admitted, at the hours prescribed by the Rubric. After Mass he remained for sometime at home, and received all who had business with him. His visits among his flock were not unfrequent, and he carried piety and recollection with him, wherever he went, and diffused them among all that were present. He was always serene, cheerful, affable, unaffected prudent, and charitable; he never said any thing, which tended, even remotely, to his own advantage; he always listened, with modest attention, and interrupted no one, unless the glory of God, or the defence of his neighbour, made it necessary. He reprov'd with

the greatest gentleness. His conduct abundantly verified the golden maxim of St. Francis of Sales, that, 'a good man is never outdone in good manners.' He generally contrived to instil, without affectation, some lesson of piety, or some salutary truth. His visits were always short, and nothing, except the most urgent necessity, ever kept him from returning home, at a very early hour, that he might be ready to hear Confessions, to give advice, to catechise, to attend to the calls of the sick, or dying, or to exercise any other missionary duty. Attention to the poor could not be carried further than it was, at all times, carried by him. It was his favourite duty; they had the most free access to him; he relieved, or procured relief for them, to the utmost of his power. From several rich Catholics, he obtained ample supplies for that purpose.

At the period of which we speak, the laws against the Catholics, were a great restraint on Catholic preaching. In the public Chapels, few sermons were allowed; but some zealous Missionaries preached in the rooms of individuals, or in rooms hired for the purpose, and even in public houses. In such places, the voice of Dr. Challoner was often heard: his sermons were instructive and affecting: they were delivered with mildness, but impressively; the love of God was his favourite theme; it often was the only subject of his sermon; and, when this was not the case, it was sure to form a large portion of it.

Both in discourse and writing, Dr. Challoner was an able controvertist, he was perfectly master of his subject, methodical, cogent, and perspicuous, never rude or overbearing. In his discussions with Protestants, and in conversing with those who sought instruction in the Catholic faith, he always began with the authority of the Church; he recommended this practice to others. 'If you begin with any other article,' he used to say, 'the dispute is almost endless; for when you have convinced the person of the truth in that article of the Catholic faith, you must proceed to convince him in all the others. But, having once convinced him of the authority of the Church, disputation ends, and instruction only remains. For, the authority of the Church being once admitted, all questions on the truth of the articles of her creed become useless; the only question then is, What they are?'

In 1729, the celebrated Dr. Conyers Middleton published a *Letter from Rome, shewing an exact conformity between Popery and Paganism; or, the religion of the present Romans derived from that of their Heathen Ancestors*. Dr. Challoner replied to it, by his *Catholic Christian Instructed*, in which he discusses the points in dispute with great learning and solidity. He proves, that the generality of the arguments, by which Dr. Middleton attempted to show the conformity between the Catholic Church and Paganism, might be used by the Dissenter, to shew a similar conformity between the Pagans and the Established Church. To this Dr. Middleton replied in the fourth edition of his work; but, in this, he found it necessary to defend himself from another charge. Dr. Challoner's reply had shewn, that the arguments of Dr. Middleton to destroy the miracles of the Church of Rome, tended to discredit all miracles: and to promote a general spirit of incredulity. These suggestions of Dr. Challoner made a great impression, and Dr. Middleton soon found, that the divines of the Established Church were alarmed at the ultimate tendency and effect of his opinions, and that, on this account, he had excited their displeasure.

These alarms were increased by another work published by Dr. Middleton, 'tending to shew, that we have no sufficient reason to believe, upon the authority of the primitive Fathers, that any miraculous powers continued to the Church after the death of the apostles.' This work increased the displeasure of the Established Clergy. They observed, that the reasons by which the Doctor attempted to shake the authority of the primitive miracles, might be supposed to apply to the miracles recorded in the Gospel: and, that a Protestant could use no arguments to support the primitive miracles, that might not be used, with equal propriety, by the Catholics, for defen-

ding the uninterrupted succession of miracles from the Apostles' time to their own. This added to the irritation. Dr. Challoner and Dr. Middleton, became the objects of, perhaps, equal anger; the Penal Laws against the Catholics, furnished, against the former, certain weapons by which the latter could not be attacked. With those, Dr. Challoner was loudly threatened: he was, therefore, advised to retire to the Continent, and there to wait till the storm should subside.

With this advice he complied, and repaired to Doway College. Dr. Williams, who was then President of that Establishment, died in 1738. A contest for Dr. Challoner then took place, between the Dowayans and Dr. Benjamin Petre, the Vicar Apostolic of the London District; the former earnestly soliciting Dr. Challoner for their President; the latter as earnestly soliciting him for Coadjutor. Dr. Petre prevailed. His Holiness nominated Dr. Challoner Bishop of Debra and Coadjutor to Dr. Petre, with the right of succeeding him as Vicar Apostolic of the London District. He was accordingly consecrated on the feast of St. Francis of Sales, the 29th of January 1741.

He chose for his model, the holy Prelate, on whose festival he was consecrated, and practised, through life, the virtues for which that Prelate was distinguished. He showed the same zeal for the conversion of heretics, and the conversion of sinners; the same ardour to promote the glory of God, and the welfare of his neighbour; the same disinterestedness; the same love of his clergy; the same discretion; and the same humility. The whole of his prelacy was a mild and equable exertion of those virtues which became a Catholic Bishop. All virtuous Ecclesiastics were respected by him: the timid, he strove to animate; those who were contented to remain in decencies, he encouraged to nobler aims; but, for those who were truly men of God, his affection and veneration knew no limit.

He said his office with his Chaplains; these were the happiest hours of his life. It was his delight, after the agitation and hurry of business, to repeat with them, the tender and soothing psalms, hymns, and prayers, of which it is composed. By this any ruffle of the day was quickly smoothed, and his mind, fatigued by business or study, soon recovered its wonted freshness and elasticity.

In imitation of S. Vincent of Paul, he held spiritual conferences with his Clergy. After the usual invocation of the Holy Ghost, he made a familiar address to them, to kindle in their hearts the fire of divine love, and of zeal for the salvation of their neighbours. If any one wanted advice, on any matter relating to his functions, he proposed his difficulty, and the matter was briefly discussed and solved. The same administration of instruction and of the Sacraments to the poor, which he had practised, before his elevation to the Episcopal dignity, he could not, after that time, practise; but the poor were still his peculiar care. They thronged to his house at all hours, they were always kindly received, and, when it was in his power, always relieved. No public Catholic Charity was without his assistance. It was chiefly owing to his exertions, that Mrs. Carpue's excellent school for girls, at Hammer-smith, and the Rev. Mr. Errington's school for boys, at Sedgley Park, were instituted. He particularly protected the 'Educating Society,' now the chief branch of the 'Associated Catholic Charities.'

Two practices of piety were particularly inculcated by Dr. Challoner, attention to the presence of God, and devotion to his Virgin Mother. To inculcate the former, he translated a small treatise upon it, by Henri Marie Boudon, the pious Archdeacon of Evreux. To encourage the latter, he published or edited a pamphlet, entitled '*The Devotion of Catholics to the Blessed Virgin Mary, truly stated.*'

(To be continued.)

ECCLESIASTICAL INTELLIGENCE.

A letter lately received from Rome gives the following intelligence :

'We have at present three converts from Protestantism in our College (Propaganda), two Americans, Wood and Montford from Cincinnati, and one Englishman named Fergusson from Bath. The latter is destined for the mission of N. S. Wales. He suffered greatly on account of his conversion, having been turned out of doors by his family. The mission just alluded to, is in a most flourishing state under the able direction of the Right Revd. Dr. Polding. The Government has granted the sum of £900 (9,000 Rs.) for the equipment and passage of six Catholic missionaries to that Island.

Three or four days ago the Pope protested formally in a Consistory against the forcible deposition of the Archbishop of Posen by the king of Prussia. The 'allocution' delivered on the occasion by the Holy Father was universally admired.

The same day he created four new Cardinals, Father Bianchi (a most saintly man, his own confessor), Monsignor Ferr etti, Archbishop of Fermo, and lately Nuncio at Naples, Monsignor De Angelis some time since Nuncio in Switzerland, and Monsignor Pignatelli, Archbishop of Palermo.

Rome, July 10th 1839.

Intelligence.

(From the Catholic Magazine, for May, 1839.)

OXBURGH.—On the 10th ult., an auxiliary branch of the Catholic Institute, consisting of the congregations of Lynn, Oxburgh, and Thetford, was formed, under the title of 'the West Norfolk Auxiliary Catholic Institute.' The meeting was addressed by the Rev. J. Gascoyne, Chairman, the Rev. C. Brigham and by the Rev. J. Holden. Sir H. Bedingfeld has been requested to act as president, and the Rev. J. Gascoyne has agreed to act as secretary, and J. Rumball, Esq., as treasurer. Alluding to the recent visit of the apostate O'Beirne, Mr. Brigham remarked, that he and his brother clergymen had been under the necessity of defending their religious principles against the gratuitous and diabolical charges of the unprincipled renegade. In so doing, they had necessarily incurred considerable expense, which, ordinarily speaking, a Catholic priest, from his scanty income, was ill able to bear. He informed the meeting (and he communicated the information with much pleasure, because he deemed it an encouraging earnest of what the Institute would do) that he had forwarded to the committee of the Catholic Institute a statement of the expenses formerly incurred for that purpose; and that the committee had generously undertaken to defray the expenses so incurred, and had voted, a sum of money towards the expense of publishing a pamphlet he had prepared, embodying the various lectures and proceedings against the charges and slanders of the renegade; showing up the fellow in his true character, and placing before the public an especial and authentic letter from Dr. Montague. President of Maynooth; with various pieces of intelligence, that may be of effectual service to those who may hereafter be under the necessity of meeting the itinerant slanderer.

WORKINGTON.—The Rev. C. F. Kershaw has lately been delivering, to crowded audiences in his chapel, a series of lectures on the controverted points of Catholic doctrine; and Protestants have flocked to the sacred edifice, in search after truth, with an earnest anxiety truly honourable to their feelings. The spirit of inquiry which distinguishes the present age, and the inhabitants

of this country more especially, can find no them more important or sublime, involving as it does in this world peace of mind, and in the next a long futurity of bliss. A young theological sciolist, painting for *éclat*, threw down the gauntlet in the shape of two pamphlets 'On the Popery and the Second Commandment;' but Mr. Kershaw has demolished his sophistry and misrepresentations in a masterly reply. The *Whitehaven Herald*, of the 20th of April, thus alludes to Mr. K.'s labours:—"On his arrival amongst his flock, he, as became a zealous believer of the doctrines he came to preach, issued out placards in a friendly tone, and expressive of a wish to expound to all who felt any interest in them, the doctrines of the church, *such as they really were*. His lectures were numerous and respectably attended. That those who had an interest in misrepresenting the doctrine of the Church of Rome, should take umbrage at Mr. Kershaw's well-frequented lecture, was to be expected. Not more alarmed was the silversmiths of Ephesus, lest the preaching of St. Paul should cause 'their craft to be set at naught,' than were some rabid bigots of Workington, lest the creed of *their own* forefathers should be shown to be less black than it suited those pious and affectionate descendants of those forefathers to paint it. Accordingly, two pamphlets appeared, addressed to the Rev. C. F. Kershaw, taxing the Catholic world with the stale and often-refuted charge of idolatry!!! The people of Workington very naturally looked upon those pamphlets as an insult to their own intellects, as if they could be cozened, in the present enlightened age, to believe so silly a charge.'

SCOTLAND.—DUNDEE.—The Catholic congregation of this town lately presented to their excellent and much esteemed pastor, the Rev. John Macpherson, a splendid silver tea service, beautifully chased after the antique, the inside lined with gold. Each article bears an appropriate device emblematical of the clan Macpherson, and the chief one has the following inscription—"Presented to the Reverend John Macpherson, by the Catholic Congregation of Dundee, as a public testimony of their respect and esteem for his personal merit, and of their gratitude for his unwearied exertions and moral improvement.—1st Feb. 1839

FRANCE.—PARIS.—On the feast of Holy Innocents a charity meeting was held, at which 25,000 francs were collected for the support of the orphans left destitute by the cholera.

M. Lepavec, Lazarist, Missionary at Smyrna, arrived here, bringing with him two young ladies, who were desirous to become Sisters of Charity. They are both Greeks, but of Persian origin. After their noviciate, they are to return to Smyrna to form an establishment of Sister of Charity.

The Right Rev. Dr. Gillis, Coadjutor of the Bishop of Edinburgh, has lately officiated and preached in many of the churches in Paris. His hearers were astonished at the purity of his accent and fluency of delivery, and many mistook him for a French Bishop. A similar mistake was committed a few years ago. An Abbé, after hearing M. (now bishop) Gillis preach one day, was quite enraptured with his eloquence, and after meeting Colonel M——I, said, 'Eh bien M. le Colonel, que pensez vous de mon compatriot? Le vôtre! c'est le mien!' The abbé was amazed to find that the preacher was a Scotchman. Dr. Gillis has given many interesting details as to the progress of the Catholic religion in Scotland, which has excited great interest in France. The plan of the *Œuvres* of the *propagation de la Foi* not embracing the mission of Great Britain, Dr. Gillis is endeavouring to organize another society in France, the object of which will be to afford pecuniary aid to Catholic churches and missions in those European kingdoms where Protestantism predominate.

The prayers for the conversion of England, as recommended by the Archbishop of Paris, at the suggestion of the Hon. and Rev. George Spencer, took place on the 25th of January, and ended on the 5th of March. The example is likely to be followed by the whole of Catholic Europe.

The number of Calvinist ministers in France, at the beginning of this year, was 393; 12 suffragans, and 90 consistorial churches. The Lutherans have

228 ministers. The Calvinists have a faculty of theology at Montauban, and the Lutherans one at Strasburg, with five professors in each.

The Society of Relief of prisoners confined for Small Debts, met on the 15th of February, in the church of the Foreign Missions, over which the Abbé Annet, curé of St. Merry, presided. This society, which has existed for thirty years, has relieved 830 prisoners, assisted 2,200 who had been detained, and consoled and relieved about 11,000 persons.

Two missionaries and a brother of the Congregation of St. Lazarus, have embarked at Havre for China. Since the month of December, the Seminary of the Holy Ghost has sent six priests to Guadaloupe, to replace a similar number who have been carried off by the yellow fever. This seminary has also sent two priests to the Isle of Bourbon, and two to Guiana. The Abbé Lacordaire has gone to Rome to enter as a novice with the Dominicans. Before his departure, he published a memoir on the re-establishment of the order of Preaching Brothers in France. In this memoir the author gives a history of the order, points out the services it has rendered to religion, and the distinguished men whom it has produced, and states his motives for entering the order, and his reasons for desiring its restoration in France. On his return, the Abbé means to found some establishments of the order, and to devote himself to preaching, the object for which it was instituted.

The Abbé Molot has been nominated Bishop of Orleans.

BELIUM.—Two English ladies, a mother and daughter, converts from Protestantism, lately received conditional baptism at Furnes.

BURGES.—The work of the Propagation of the Faith has been established in this town.

MALINES.—The common Schepers has founded here an institute of brothers, under the title of the Brothers of our Lady of Mercy. This establishment, which has been approved of by the Archbishop, has for its objects the succour of prisoners and the sick, and the instruction of the poor.

The populations of Belgium, on the 1st January, 1837, is thus stated as to religion, viz.: 4,216,755 Catholics; for the support of whose worship, the sum of 4,016,150 francs was allowed by the budget; 6,033 Protestants, allowance 79,000 francs; 1,752 Jews, allowance 10,000 fr.; and 13,754 persons of no declared religion, residing chiefly in Brabant. Of the Protestant, there are 1,113 in Limburg 1,016 Hainaut, 917 in Brabant, 815 in West Flanders, 695 at Anvers, 691 in East Flanders, 609 at Liege, 124 at Namur, and 9 in Luxembourg.

BRUSSELS.—The number of Catholic priests in the provinces of Anvers, Brabant, Hainaut, East Flanders Leige, Limbourg and Luxembourg, amounts to 6,981. West Flanders and the province of Namur, is not included in this enumeration. There are only sixty-two Protestant ministers in these provinces. Total population of Belgium, 4,247,561.

SAXONY.—Barron de Bussière the French minister at Dresden, has given 1,000 francs to the Catholic church at Coburg, and 2,000 francs to that of Gotha; the latter sum to aid in the erection of a chapel. The late Duchess of Wurtemberg, it is understood, obtained their grants from the French government.

PALESTINE.—In May last, the guardian father of the Holy Land baptised in the church of Arissa seventeen Turks, belonging to the village of Fetrum. Thirty other Mahometans of Palestine have been instructed, and were preparing for baptism.

Duke Maximilian of Bavaria was at Jerusalem in the month of May. He has restored, at his own expense, the sanctuary of the flagellation of our Saviour.

SWITZERLAND.—BALE.—The Bishop of Bale, who resides at Soleure, has solicited the Archbishop of Paris to authorise a collection to be made for the establishment of a Catholic School at Bale. In 1798, there were scarcely 100 Catholics in this town; they now amount to about 6,000.

SOLEURE.—The fine Cathedral of this town has been entirely restored by an artist named Parozzi.

ALGIERS.—Mr. Dupach, Bishop of Algiers, arrived in his diocese on the 31st of December. He disembarked under a salute from town, and was received by the civil and military authorities with all the honours due to his rank. On the 29th of January, he received in the cathedral the vows of five sisters of the congregation of the Apparition, on which occasion his Lordship addressed them in an affecting manner. The objects of these Ladies are to remove the prejudices of the infidels, to support the indigent, and assuage the miseries of the afflicted.

ISLE OF BOURBON.—Two ecclesiastics, viz., Messrs. Bourgade and Soullons, dove lately embarked at Pouillac for this island.

THE GAMBIER ISLANDS.—Intelligence has been lately received from the abbé Carret, missionary from Picpus who left France last year for this mission. Arrived at Valparaiso about the end of August, with his small colony, and numerous articles suitable for his enterprise, which he had collected in Europe, and was about to proceed to complete his voyage.

AVIGNON.—There was established towards the end of 1835, a Society of the Faith, which devotes itself to every kind of good work. The society is divided into five sections or committees, viz. one for the sick, another for visiting prisoners, a third for marriages, a fourth for the instruction of the ignorant, and a fifth for the relief of poor persons who are ashamed to avow their poverty. The late Abbé Sollier, grand-vicar and founder of the society was its first president. The members hold meetings every Sunday to excite the zeal of the associates, and to enforce the observance of the rules. They also hold daily meetings and discourse upon religion. The annual meeting is held on the 8th of December, the feast of the immaculate conception. The society is doing much good, and gaining yearly in importance. At its third annual meeting, on the 8th December, 1838, from the report it appeared, that during the last year, fifty-eight men, who had neglected their religious duties, had been induced to approach the sacraments; ten had made their first communion; seventeen had been confirmed; four Protestants had abjured their errors, and twenty children had been instructed for their first communion. The section for the sick had visited the hospital and sick persons in their own houses, had ministered to their bodily wants, and had lent them pious books. The section for marriages had procured the celebration of twenty-nine marriages, and legitimized seven children. That for the relief of the poor, had distributed 1,437 francs, and given away 1,905 articles of clothing. The revenue for the year was 2,740 francs, and the expenditure 2,920 francs. The number of associates, or annual subscribers, was fifty-seven; books in the library, 796 volumes; lent to read during the year, 900 volumes to 165 persons.

RHEIMS.—The municipal council has voted the sum of 292,000 francs towards the complete restoration of the magnificent cathedral of that town.

ITALY.—The Chevalier Spontini, superintendent of music at the court of Prussia, has given a sum of 30,600 francs for the erection of a mont de piété for the poor at Jesi, his native place.

TURIN.—On the 9th of May, an English lady abjured Protestantism in the church of St. Saviour, at Turin; and was afterwards baptised conditionally.

About the end of last year (1837) another English lady, of literary acquirements was also received into the Church in the same city.

MARSEILLES.—A lady of the Calvinistic profession in this town, has abjured Protestantism. She was baptised conditionally. The bishop delivered a suitable exhortation on the occasion, in presence of a number of persons who witnessed the ceremony.

AMIENS.—M. Lérailly, curé of St. Remi, has presented 8,000 francs to the Hospital of Incurables.

TURIN.—On the 22nd of December, Elizabeth Wild, aged twenty-four years, a native of Ipswich, abjured Protestantism in the chapel of the hospital.

NAPLES.—On the 2nd of November last, two Protestant soldiers of the 1st Swiss regiment, in the service of the King, abjured Protestantism.

FLOWERS FROM THE HOLY FATHERS.

No. X.

' Quid enim hominibus ex iis rebus, quibus frui atque potiri student, vita pacifica dulcious ? quodeunque nominaveris ex iis, quæ in vita suavia et jucunda sunt, pace indiget, ad hoc ut juceundum sit. Etenim si suppetant divitiæ, bona valetudo, domus, hortamæni, quæcunque demum Voluptatis inventa sunt, quæcunque delicias sectantes recreant possunt, si pacis bonum defuerit, quod inde lucri est ? aut quid prosunt ? bello, quo mine us fruamur, impediante.'—*Sti Gregorii Nysseni. Lib. 8. Beati.*

What are the lavish gifts of earth,
Honour, or pomp, or pride of birth,—
And what is power, and brimful wealth,
Broad lands, and friends, and jocund health,
What though each want, and wish, and taste,
Be followed out, with instant haste,
Woe, and alas ! what boots all these,
Where God is not, and Heaven's peace ?

The bowering woods, and sunny skies,
May lend an air of Paradise,
Peace on the earthly Eden smile,
Yet *he* who walks therein, the while,
Alone unkin to all around,
May walk with inward festering wound,
His heart give back no echoing voice—
Alien to peace, and Heavenly joys.

Oh, subtle depths of sin and pride,
Bane of all peace, and portal wide,
That leads not on to sweet repose,
But canker here, and future woes,
Oh ! when will thoughtless man return
From idle waste, and sorrows bourne,
To find, within, a conscience pure—
A bed of flowers,* where peace is sure !

Oh ye whose troubled hearts within
Ful filled with guilt and rankling sin,
Whate'er thy state, by thine unrest,
Haste thee to the Tribunal blest,
With contrite heart, and humble eye,
Unfold thy hidden misery,
Water the choir with dewy eyes,
And through thy tears, see peace arise !

Oh by th' experience of those
Who sought it there, and found repose
Let not another sun decline
Before thou makest Heaven thine,
And then let fortune smile or frown,
Let angry storms look idly down,
Welcome despite, contempt, disease,
For God is thine—and God is Peace !

*Printed by Messrs. W. Rushton and Co., Calcutta, for the Proprietors
price one rupee per month, or ten rupees per annum in advance. To non-
subscribers 8 annas per number.*

THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

'One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.'

No. XVII.

OCTOBER 26, 1839.

VOL. I.

VISION OF THE THREE-ARCH REFORMATION-BRIDGE.

As the 'Vision' in our last number ran to much greater length than we had expected, we were obliged to conclude it abruptly, and omit several very curious parts, which were presented to us concerning the Reformation-Bridge. However interesting they may be to the public, we should hardly venture again to fall asleep, in order to detail them, if there were not at present, in the atmosphere, something peculiarly soporiferous, which favours the visions of a dream. For business, at command of the Goddess Doorga, has now stopped its bustling toils; public offices are closed; the hushed city seems sunk in the arms of repose; not a sound breaks upon the ear, save the caw of the rooks, who will not, like the Christians, do honor to the goddess; the editor, condemned to work (Oh! hard condition) whilst all are dozing around him, nods—starts—and nods again, as he bends writing over his desk. What wonder, then, if sleep should 'gently press *our* eyelids down, and steep *our* senses in forgetfulness' of all the vulgar concerns of life! Yes;—already the balmy influence of the god begins softly to steal over us—the bridge opens on the view—the arches grow more distinct—oh! there it is again!

Methought I was walking along the Anglican bridge towards the extreme point, where the first foundation stone was laid; I was surprised, notwithstanding the caution of my guide, to observe the frequent openings in the arches, the ill-shaped blocks of rough stone which were every where jutting out from the masonry, and the loose heaps of materials which lay strewn about the road. Having, with youthful agility, tript lightly over the dangers which beset my path, I turned round for a moment to look at my aged friend, who, I supposed, would be at some distance behind me; but, to my great astonishment, I saw him close at my side, walking with firm and careless footstep, as if every danger was familiar to him! We had now come to the first arch: and, as the road (which, very dangerous at first, improved as we advanced,) was now tolerably safe, I ventured to speak to my friend. 'May I ask,' said I, 'the

name of the venerable person, who has offered so kindly to be my guide ?' Smiling with an amiable countenance, and putting his hand on my shoulder, he told me that he was the Bishop of Meaux, and that he had often conducted young persons, like myself, over the broken and *variable* pavement of the Reformation-Bridge.

'Do you observe,' said he, pointing to the narrow dilapidated arches of the Waldenses,— 'those cliffs in front of us, which, from the spot where we now are, seem not far distant from the extreme point of this bridge ? It is often said, that the two bridges are connected together, and that the Reformation-Bridge is only a continuation of the other, from which the materials, now used, were procured.' As we drew nearer the end of the Anglican-Bridge, the stream, which flowed betwixt its head-point and the Waldensian ridges, grew wider and wider, until, when I stood at length on the pier head, I saw that there intervened the distance of three great arches betwixt us and the ruinous bridge of the Waldenses. 'Oh !' said I to my guide, who was pleased at my surprise, 'this is rather a long leap for masons to take, when they are carrying huge blocks of granite.' 'Not a longer leap,' said he, 'than it would be necessary to make from that broken arch beyond, built in the eastern style, to the Waldensian-bridge. In fact, from the bank of human life, to the opposite shore of Paradise, there is not, along the broken interrupted line of arches forming the Bridge of Heresy, a single cluster which was not begun and abandoned without connexion, either with the arches which precede, or with those that come after. Look attentively at yonder Waldensian Bridge ! The quality and nature of the stone—the shape and size of the blocks—the style of building used—show clearly, that the makers of them built by a very different rule, and on very different principles, from those adopted by the men who began these three Reformation arches,—the last in the broken Bridge of Heresy. The builders of each separate cluster, had been workmen on the bridge of Catholic Tradition ; but refusing there to build by the universal rule handed down from the Apostolic arch, they withdrew apart, and began to form arches on their own plan, until, becoming more feeble and disunited as the work advanced, they were overpowered by the stream of Time. Hence, as the plan of each dissenting body was as different as the cause of dissent, the distinct clusters of arches in the Bridge of Heresy rose out of the flood, as different from each other, as from the bridge of Catholic Tradition. There is not a cluster that has not used some Catholic materials, which the others reject. For you must bear in mind, that when the refractory workmen left the Catholic bridge, they took with them, not only the rule book which they interpreted for themselves, but as many of the Catholic blocks of pure marble, as suited their fancy. Thus Luther, Calvin, Cranmer, who laid the foundations of the three first narrow arches running alongside of each other in this broad Reformation-Bridge, conveyed away many blocks which had been rejected, and left behind others which had been selected, by previous revolvers from the Catholic Bridge. But the most singular fact is, that the builders of the thousand arched-ridges, which compose the Reformation-Bridge, differed among *themselves* in the choice of materials. Follow me, and I will convince you of the truth of what I tell you.'

There was one corner of the bridge, which, having to stem the full force of the current, had been in part washed away, or laid in ruins, by the ravages of the stream. Descending carefully on the projecting rocks,

we arrived at the water-edge ; where we could see well the different blocks of stone composing the ill-joined and mis-shapen arch, which, with a tremulous motion, waved perceptibly over our heads. I shuddered as I looked up at the suspended pile. ' See,' said my fearless guide, ' the several marble-blocks of the Catholic Bridge lying here mixed with stone-rocks, which have been brought from the quarry on the bank of human life.' On one marble block I saw engraven **UNITY OF GOD** ; on another **TRINITY** ; on a third **DIVINITY OF CHRIST** ; on a fourth **EPISCOPACY** ; on a fifth **REAL PRESENCE** ; but in this I perceived that the letters were partially erased, whilst the next stone to it—a rough, unhewn stone from the human quarry—displayed in broad characters, the words **FIGURATIVE PRESENCE**. I observed other marble-blocks similar in quality, shape, and name, to marble-blocks which I had seen, ready for use, on the Catholic Tradition-Bridge. My conductor informed me, that there were fewer of those well-wrought blocks of pure marble in the second arch than in the first, and that they decreased in number still more in the third.

From the base where we stood, it was easy to pass from the Anglican Bridge to Calvin's, and thence to Luther's Bridge, which was the first of the collection of Reformation-Bridges. As I was very anxious to see how the chief-reformer had built his bridge, I begged of my guide to conduct me to it. Leaping the narrow space, which intervened betwixt the two bridges, we soon gained a spot, where we could see the rough bridge of Luther swelling boldly on our left, and the Calvinistic bridge frowning down on us with a dark scowl on our right. The key-stone of both was a huge stone-block from the human quarry. On that of Luther's were engraven, in large capitals, the words '**SIN STOUTLY, BUT BELIEVE MORE STOUTLY**': on that of Calvin's, '**MAN NOT FREE**.' I was very much amused to see over Luther's key-stone, the grotesquely-carved figure of a jolly fellow, who, finding it difficult with the huge load of good works which he carried, to screw himself through the narrow trap-door of heaven, was about to toss the bag and its contents into the stream below. I observed fewer marble-blocks in these two first bridges, than in the third bridge, from which we had descended. The main part was built from the stone-quarry, and on each block of stone was engraven a name, which expressed the reverse of some name, which I had traced on the Catholic marble-blocks.

When I had satisfied my curiosity in surveying the parts deserving of notice in the two bridges, my guide, beckoning to me that I should follow him, climbed up the shattered end of Luther's bridge, which was more loosely set, and more exposed to the violence of the stream than the Anglican bridge, and soon reached the summit. ' Observe,' said my guide, as soon as I came up to him, ' how fast the workmen are beginning to abandon these three first bridges, which are much longer than the rest of the reformation-cluster. Many are going back to the old strong symmetrical bridge of Catholic Tradition, whilst others choose to join the workmen at the new fantastical arches, which every day are seen beginning to rise above the stream. The work in the three first bridges will, ere long, be altogether discontinued ; and when the river of time shall have washed away a large portion of the bank of human life, they will stand in the midst of the surrounding waters, like the Arian and Waldensian ruins, isolated fragments of arches and monuments of human folly.' ' Let

us then, 'said I to my guide,' leave these bridges which the builders of them are forsaking, and take a survey of those shorter modern arches yonder.' At the word, my aged guide sprang from the Lutheran to the Calvinistical bridge—so narrow was the intervening space,—and thence to the Anglican, with all the easy nimbleness of youth; and then turning to the left, he walked towards the bank of life, until he came opposite to the head of the Puritan bridge, where he stopped.

It was some time before I joined my conductor, as, in returning on the Anglican bridge, my attention had been arrested by a Fountain, which was pouring forth, from two mouths, streams of water very unlike the seven limped, sparkling, vivifying streams of the Catholic Fountain. I examined the tube which supplied it; and I found, after some trouble, (for the funnel was artfully concealed,) that it curved beneath in the direction of the bank of human life. 'Look now,' said my guide, as soon as I was by his side, 'at the close succession of bridges before you. The more distant each one is from us, the less in it is there of Catholic marble. There is one principle in which all the workmen of the several bridges perfectly agree, and only one: it is this, that each one shall have a *RULE BOOK*, and shall interpret it as he pleases; but this principle, in which all agree, is the fruitful source of disagreement, and of that endless variety and discrepancy which you observe in the style of building.' Seeing the artisans on a distant bridge, working demurely with broad-brimmed hats and buttonless coats, and those on the next leaping, shaking, and jumping as if they had a mind to break down the bridge which they had been at so much trouble to erect, I manifested playfully my desire to skip over to them, in order to see more closely their droll method of building. But my venerable guide shook his head, and conducted me back to the head-point of the Anglican Bridge. 'Young man you wish to know where Truth is to be found. Jesus Christ,—on the opposite bank, is the only source whence it proceeds. Which channel is most likely to convey it with safety? This broken bridge of Heresy, where all is discord, or that unbroken solid bridge of Catholic Tradition, where all is union and harmony? Judge for yourself.' Wrapt in thought and wonder, I stood for some time regarding the triumphant arches of the Catholic Bridge, which seemed the combined effort of Divine Wisdom and Divine Power. I turned to address my guide, but he had disappeared. Eager to return, I made a false step, and slipped into one of the crevices. Awaking with the effort to extricate myself, I found, to my agreeable surprise, that I had only tumbled from the couch, where I had been sleeping.

It appearing that some of our subscribers have not received a copy of the letter addressed by the Holy See to the Right Reverend the Acting Vicar Apostolic of Bengal, which we briefly noticed in our last, we insert it to-day, as also an extract of a letter from the Honourable the Court of Directors, to the Madras Government, on the same subject.

This painful dispute will, we sincerely hope, now terminate. Indeed we are unable to imagine any possible pretext on which it can be continued. For how can the pretensions of Portugal be urged against the declared wishes of the Spiritual Head of the Catholic Church and the Civil Government of the country? We are aware that some of the Portuguese, Clergy appeal to a Concordate concluded some hundreds of years ago,

between the Holy See and the Crown of Portugal. The appeal is futile : for it must be obvious to common sense that it could never have been contemplated at the time by either of the contracting parties, that this convention should remain in force after the power and influence which the Portuguese then possessed in India had passed, as it now happily has, into other hands. How could the crown of Portugal be expected to perform its part of the conditions in a country where it had ceased to possess a particle of authority ? With as much reason and justice might France claim the right of patronage in Canada and the Mauritius, respecting which similar Concordates existed between the crown of France and the Holy See, before they came under British sway. But, allowing that the Government of Portugal held the same position in this country as when the concordate was concluded, still its right of patronage would be entirely forfeited by its failure to observe the conditions upon which that right or privilege was conceded. For instance, it was expressly provided that the See of St. Thomé at Malia-pore should not be allowed to remain vacant more than two years, whereas there has not been a Bishop there, we believe, for upwards of thirty years. This fact alone would, under any circumstances, prove fatal to the pretensions of Portugal. Besides, it is notorious to the Catholic World, that the present Government of Portugal is not in a condition to exercise ecclesiastical patronage even in that kingdom itself, to say nothing of British India. It is indeed a singular fact, that,—while the most intelligent and respectable portion of the clergy in Portugal secretly obtain jurisdiction and faculties either from their own expatriated Bishops or from the Holy See, thro' the medium of an authority appointed for the purpose, on the ground that the spurious and schismatical authorities, introduced by the existing Government, possess no faculties or jurisdiction themselves, consequently cannot grant any to others,—some of the Portuguese clergy in this country have hitherto preferred such spurious authority to that of the Supreme Head of the Catholic Church, whose orders they refused to obey, because they did not come thro' the channel of a Government which is bent on the destruction of that holy religion, which it was the pride and the glory of Portugal, in the days of her greatness, to protect and foster. Upon the whole, it appears to us quite clear that the pretensions set up on behalf of Portugal, are without a shadow of foundation, and have been advanced without due reflection. It has been alleged that the clergy, who are Portuguese subjects, could not obey the direct spiritual authority of the Pope, without incurring the resentment of their own government. But it cannot be that the Portuguese government has arrived at such an acme of absurdity as to expect as a duty of its subject in British India, to oppose the authority of the Holy See concurred in, as it is, by the Government of the country. The Portuguese clergy have afforded their own Government ample proof of their not having hastily abandoned its pretensions, such as they are, and it is sincerely hoped that they will now think only of the interests of the Holy Religion of which they are ministers, and the preservation of Unity.

This unhappy dissension has now assumed a most serious aspect. Hitherto it was considered by many as a mere local dispute among the Clergy. They will now perceive, that it is gravely taken up as a matter affecting the Faith of the Church by her Supreme Pastor, whose admonition is addressed to *Laymen* as well as *Clergymen*, so that the *former* can no longer plead the advice or example of the *latter* as an excuse for

disobedience to the Church. We trust that we shall have no occasion to revert again to this subject, except to announce the happy tidings that unity, peace, and brotherly love have been restored.

Selections.

TO THE MOST ILLUSTRIOUS AND RIGHT REVEREND
LEWIS TABERD, BISHOP OF ISAUROPOLIS, ACTING
VICAR APOSTOLIC OF BENGAL.

Calcutta.

MOST ILLUSTRIOUS AND RIGHT REVEREND SIR,

Your Lordship already clearly understands how deeply the Sacred Congregation and also His Holiness were grieved on the receipt of certain intelligence of the continuance still in those countries of the dissension excited by those who refuse obedience to the Holy See. For it is evident that this opposition to the authority of the Vicars Apostolick can admit of no excuse. For the Apostolic letter of His Holiness Gregory the Sixteenth, dated the twenty-fourth day of April, 1838, which begins *Multa praeclare*, contains the most manifest reprobation of this dissension; and at the same time most positively declares that the then recently established Apostolical Vicariates of Bengal, Madras, and Ceylon, as well as those of Verapoli, Bombay, Pondicherry, Ava and Pegu, and of Thibet so called, were in fact established by the Apostolic See. It is also clear from the same letter, that all those countries which were contained within the limits of the Diocese of Meliapore or St. Thomas, and which were at that time subject to no Vicar Apostolick were provisionally, and until another disposition of the Apostolick See, entrusted to the jurisdiction of the Vicar Apostolic of Madras; and that the same was done with the countries which were included within the limits of the Diocese of Cranganore and Cochin, which were given to the government of the Vicar Apostolick of Verapoli. Further, it was declared in the same letter, that the country of Malacca beyond the Ganges, which constituted the Diocese of Malacca, was subjected to the Vicar Apostolick of Ava and Pegu. Finally, in the same letter it is manifestly decreed that the Vicars Apostolick were to be considered as the only true ordinaries of those countries; that all must yield obedience to them, and receive from them Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Faculties.

Moreover, it is easy to understand, that any doubt as to the authenticity of this letter could never have been publicly put forth, but for the purpose of cherishing a pretext for dissension. For this letter was sent to all the Vicars Apostolick resident in the East Indies in an Encyclical letter of the Sacred Congregation, and was published in the most solemn manner that it could be, in the name of the Apostolick See; though there was no longer any reason for sending such letter to those countries as heretofore. For the privilege of Patronage which the Most Faithful Kings of Portugal heretofore possessed over the above-mentioned Dioceses was rescinded by the Apostolick See, as clearly appears in the Apostolick Brief *Multa praeclare*.

Therefore, it is quite evident, that those who up to this time do not obey the Vicars Apostolick could have had no plausible excuse for their conduct; things had even come to such a state, that the Sacred Congregation, on the twenty-second day of April, 1839, solemnly declared that all those who refused to submit to the Vicar Apostolick of Madras, ought to be considered as notoriously disobedient.

In consequence, with the approbation of His Holiness, the Sacred Congregation addresses this letter to your Lordship, and commits to you the charge of

making this letter publick; so that all, whether Ecclesiasticks or Laymen, who up to this time refuse obedience to the Vicars Apostolick, should be warned of the necessity of paying due obedience to them as to their lawful Ordinaries. The Apostolick See hopes indeed that they will adopt more wholesome counsels, and avert from themselves the danger of being declared Schismatics by the Apostolick See, and of incurring those penalties which have been decreed against Schismatics by the Canon-law and by the Apostolical Constitutions. We trust, however, that obedient to this admonition, they will look to their own salvation, and to the tranquillity of the Church.

In the meanwhile I pray God may long preserve your Lordship in health and happiness.

Your Lordship's Most Affectionate Brother,
J. PHILIP CARDINAL FRANSONF,
Prefect of the Sacred Congregation.
J. ARCHBISHOP of EDESSA, *Secretary.*

Rome, from the Palace of the S. Cong. de Prop. Fide.

July, 23, 1839.

To the Right Reverend P. D. Lewis Taberd, Bishop of Isauropolis, acting Vicar Apostolick of Bengal.

True Copy,
+ JOHN LEWIS, *Bish. of Is., V. A. B.*

To
THE RIGHT REV. DR. O'CONNOR,
Vicar Apostolic of Madras and Meliapore.

Ecclesiastical Department,

SIR;

I am directed by the Right Honorable the Governor in council to transmit for your information the annexed Extract from a despatch from the Honorable the Court of Directors dated the 10th July 1839.

I have the honor to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient Servant,
(Signed) ROBERT CLERK.

Secy. to Govt.

FORT ST. GEORGE, 28th September 1839.

Answer to letter dated 24th January, No. 1 of 1837, Para. 8

8. Reporting that the Govt. had, with the concurrence of the Supreme Govt. recognized Dr. O'Connor, the Vicar Apostolic, as the Official Superior through whom all communications respecting the Roman Catholic Religion and Church should be made.

of his residence at Madras, have proved beneficial to the Troops. The Successor of the late Bishop of St. Thomé, who holds his appointment from the Portuguese Government only, has advanced claims to this jurisdiction; but, as his predecessor could only have been recognized in the absence of a British Roman Catholic Dignitary, the claims of the present Bishop cannot be admitted.

A true Extract,
(Signed) ROBERT CLERK, *Secy. to Govt.*

A CHAPTER FROM THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A CONVERT.

It was originally the intention of my parents to educate me for the ministry of the Church of Scotland, and, in accordance with their views, all the time I could spare from my tasks was devoted to the indiscriminate reading of all such religious books as fell in my way. The family stock was very soon exhausted, and the libraries of our neighbours for several miles round were made tributary to my invincible desire for reading. I soon discovered that the authors I had been perusing differed widely from each other in their religious opinions, and that while they all agreed that the Bible was the only standard of faith, yet each contrived to make the Bible speak his own opinions, however much opposed to those of his companions on the self; and though they differed equally from him and among one another, each produced the ready text to prove the truth of his own belief, and the falsehood of every other. When the common English version failed, recourse was had to the Hebrew and the Greek, and when these were equivocal, the various reading was called in to decide the question. Thus it appeared impossible for me to determine in my own mind what was the real doctrine of the Bible in any one particular. I now determined to read the whole Bible in connexion for myself, throwing aside as much as possible all prejudice (a difficult attempt!) and imploring the assistance of that Divine Being whom I sincerely believed to be the author of it, and of whose divine omnipresence, and particular providence, I have at every period of my life been deeply impressed. I admired exceedingly the historical parts of both Testaments, and have often shed tears in reading the account of our Saviour's trial and death. These however gave me little satisfaction respecting the object of which I was in search. The doctrines about which my authors differed were there but slightly touched on, and *I saw there doctrines hinted at which were held by none of the parties in question.* Discouraging as this certainly was, I did not give over my search, but noted down every doctrine which I thought the books revealed, and continued the perusal of the Apostolic Letters with all the earnestness which a determination to find out the truth, the apparent difficulty of the enterprise, and my hopes of that divine assistance which I entreated inspired me with. My difficulties, alas! increased as I proceeded. In every page, in every verse, and almost in every line of St. Paul I met with things 'hard to be understood,' and I became terrified at the undertaking I had engaged in. I thought of calling in the assistance of commentators, but I recollected that it was the disgust I felt at their contradictions that put me upon my present inquiry. I endeavoured, therefore, as before, to throw away every prejudice and pursuing my scripture inquiry with renewed earnestness, marking down every article of my creed as I discovered it, I concluded my investigation.

On looking over my notes I found I had discovered one of the strangest creeds that ever was known, differing materially from every other I had heard of, and not very consistent with itself. Ah! I remember some of its articles well; one of the principal was 'Jesus Christ, the great prophet, whose coming was foretold, the best and greatest of all human beings, but—only a man!' I was amazed at the result of my own labour. 'What,' said I, 'is He whom I have been taught to adore as my God and my Redeemer, only a mere man? It cannot be'—and I flung the paper into the fire.

My prayers had been heard, but they were answered in God's own way. I was one day at a loss for a new book, having exhausted all my stock, nor could I think where I should borrow. At last I recollected that there was an old book upon a certain shelf that I had never read, it having long lain with one or two others in a corner which contained various kinds of lumber. This book I remember to have seen in my infancy kicked about by my brothers and sisters as a plaything under the title of the 'Pentecost Bookie.' It was a volume of Götter's 'Afternoon Instructions' for Sundays and festivals, and

from the title at the head of every page 'Tenth Sunday after Pentecost,' &c., had obtained the above cognomen. Its equally neglected companions were an old copy of 'Turberville's Catechism,' 'The Garden of the 'Soul,' and an imperfect copy of the 'Full Manual.' These had belonged to my mother, were much read by her in her youth, but had long given place to 'Burkitt's Testament,' 'The Pilgrim's Progress,' and 'Watts' World to come.'

In my desire for something *new*, then I laid hold on these *old* books, looked at the titles of such as had escaped with the title pages and turned up the middle of those that had none. My curiosity was little excited at first, but I wanted a book, and so I began with Turberville. I read on with some astonishment, with increasing interest, but without much reflection, till I came to the following words 'Because we have proved to them that no Protestants were ever heard of in the world before Martin Luther.'*

Before I can make myself sufficiently understood, I must here state what knowledge I had of the Catholic religion previous to this period.

In the secluded parish of T—, in which I was born, there lived not a single Catholic; I had never conversed with one on the subject of religion; I had seldom heard of the Catholic religion but as a system of idolatry and superstition, adhered to only by knaves and fools, the designing and the ignorant; in fine, I had been as early taught that the Pope is antichrist as that there are three persons in God! From this awful system I believed that this happy country had been delivered by some holy men that God raised up in the sixteenth century for that purpose. But my notion was that this Protestantism was no new religion, but the real Christianity of the primitive ages. The cause of my surprise, when I read the bold assertion of Turberville, will now appear.

I did not by any means believe the assertion, but I was struck with the tone of confidence in which it is given—'We have proved to them'—and I determined to investigate its grounds. I proceeded with the rest of the Catechism, in every page of which I found something to surprise me and arrest my attention. What struck me most was the false idea that had been instilled into me respecting the doctrines of the Roman church. Here superstition was not inculcated, but expressly condemned; idolatry, in place of being taught, was strictly prohibited. An offer was made to break the crucifix and tear the picture of Christ, to convince Protestants that no virtue was believed to reside in them. No license was held out to commit sin, but an express declaration that God alone can forgive sin by his own power. It is true, that I there saw doctrines taught as integral parts of Revelation which had never before been proposed to me, but these were so well supported by scripture and reason, and the testimony of the primitive church, and were besides in such perfect harmony one with another, that I began insensibly to believe some and to wish, for the sake of uniformity, that I could believe the rest. 'Is it possible, then,' thought I, 'that all the books in which I have seen the doctrines of the Roman church treated of, are filled with misrepresentations and calumnies, and that these doctrines, so well supported by reason, Scripture, and ecclesiastical history, are distorted and falsified by all the standard writers of our Scottish church, as well as by those of every other Protestant communion? Can it be, that writers who agree in no wise among themselves, should all conspire to misstate the doctrines of one particular church, and then overturn their own creations by arguments which leave the real doctrines of that church untouched?† But does this Catechism teach the real doctrines of the church of Rome? I cannot doubt of it. This very copy is published in a foreign Catholic country, with the approbation of the doctors of a Roman Catholic Uni-

* I quote from memory, but remember the circumstance too well to mistake the meaning.

† I had not then reflected on the necessity of justifying their schisms, their cruelty to Catholics, and their keeping possession of the church property. These acts must be justified *per fas et nefas*. And this necessity is the grand source of Protestant calumny.

versity.' Such were my reflections as I read the small book which first turned my attention to the Catholic doctrines.

The next book I read was *Goiter's Instructions*. In those for the Sundays I found the purest morality and the most genuine piety enforced; this convinced me that the opinions I had imbibed regarding the morality of the Catholic church were as false as those relating to her faith. In the instructions for holidays, the controverted points of faith were proved by Scripture and the writings of the fathers, and established by a chain of argumentation, which, for clearness, precision, and consecutiveness, far surpassed any thing of the kind I had ever seen. After reading the above works, I felt myself compelled to admit the following truths: 1st. That it is an universal practice among Protestants to misrepresent the doctrines of the Church of Rome. 2nd, That the doctrines of that church are the same as those taught in the earliest ages of Christianity. 3rd, That the religions of Protestantism were unknown to all Christians for 1500 years after the preaching of Christ. 4th, That the doctrines of the church of Rome are in perfect accordance, and necessarily flow from one another, while the tenets of Protestantism, besides differing in every sect, are, in every individual sect, destructive of each other.

Years of serious study had intervened when I proposed my difficulties to the Rev. Mr. ——. Instead of meeting my objections, he began to preach to me about 'free grace' and a 'saving interest in Christ.' When I asked him how a doctrine so hard to believe as transubstantiation could have gained admission into the church without opposition? he told me 'it was imposed upon mankind in the dark ages by the popes, who then had unlimited power.' When I produced quotations from the writings of the fathers of the primitive church, clearly inculcating this doctrine, he told me, that 'the mystery of iniquity was already working.' I pressed upon him the inconsistency of these two opinions, and he replied, that 'the monks had adulterated the writings of the fathers.' I then asked him, how it had happened that while the writings of the fathers were adulterated by the monks, the writings of the apostles and the other books that make up the New Testament were preserved pure, both having come through the same hands? he told me, that 'God had preserved his word pure.' I then asked, how, rejecting the fathers, he could know it to be God's word; and further, how it happened that Christ had preserved the new Testament entire without ever promising to do so, or even alluding to its ever having existence, while he had allowed his church to fall into error for many ages, contrary to his express promise, that the gates of hell should not prevail against her? He told me these were 'Jesuitical quibbles; advised me to 'go home and read my Bible with a *prayerful reading*,' and assured me that the Spirit would direct me.

I told him that these 'quibbles' were to me questions of great importance; that they had engaged my attention for a considerable time; and that I had twenty other difficulties of the same nature, which I entreated him to solve, as the clear solution of them could alone prevent me from embracing the Roman Catholic religion. He then commenced a furious harangue against Anti-Christ, the W— of Babylon, &c, which had something of the same effect upon me as the reading of certain controversial authors had upon Gibbon—that of converting him to the opposite side.

In addition to this conference and the reading of all such books of controversy as I could meet with, I proposed my doubts to two other divines of the church of Scotland, who were equally unable to solve them. All that I read and all that I heard and reflected upon, confirmed me in the belief that the Roman Catholic church alone possesses the characters which distinguish the church of Christ; that she alone stands unchanged amid the revolutions of nineteen centuries; that the change of religion in the sixteenth century was not the work of God, but sprang from the corrupted passions of unholy men; and that it was propagated by a series of crimes hardly exceeded by any on record.

There were two Catholic chapels, each at a distance of about ten or twelve miles from our farm. Both were served by the Rev. L. M. I went then to the chapel of G—, on a Sunday morning to hear Mass for the first time. It was preceded by a sermon, which had more of piety than eloquence, on the crime of the unworthy communicant, which the preacher compared to the treason of Judas. There was nothing of that figurative and often unmeaning cant which distinguish the sermons of our sectaries; but there was a fervour, a zeal and a consciousness of authority, which none but a Catholic preacher can assume without making himself ridiculous.

Then there were the lights, and the altar, and the sacerdotal garments, the very materials and form of which prove the antiquity of the worship, carry the mind far away into the distant and the past, and speak also of that future world where the just shall be gathered together to adore the Lamb that was slain.

I continued to attend alternately the chapels of G. and C. with a burning desire to be in communion with the great church of ages and nations; but my natural diffidence and timidity prevented me for some time introducing myself to the venerable pastor. At last I had the courage one day to wish him a 'Good morning.' 'Wha's aight you, my chiel?'* said the aged missionary. Oh, oh! thought I, you are not so inaccessible as I expected. I gave him my history and my intentions in a few words; we conversed together all the afternoon; he opened up an immense source of ecclesiastical knowledge to me, illustrated his reasoning by the most interesting anecdotes, and exhibited before me the church of God in all her beauty of holiness. Our conversations were as frequent as possible; he kindly supplied me with books; I was soon a well-instructed Catholic, and—happy day!—I made my first communion on the 6th of August, 1826. Storms of various kinds were now collecting around me, and I was about to suffer persecution where I least expected it. From the effects of some of these troubles I still suffer; but the particulars I will not narrate, at least during the lives of individuals whose feelings I am bound, under all circumstances, to respect.

It is enough for me that I have found rest for my mind in the bosom of truth; that the shades of doubt and uncertainty have disappeared; that I am in communion with the church of all the saints—the temple of the living God, where I hope to finish my days in his fear and love, and sing allelujahs around his throne in the eternal dwellings.

W. A. D,

Anglicé, 'Of what family are you, my child?'

BIOGRAPHICAL ACCOUNT

Of the Venerable and Right Reverend DOCTOR CHALLONER, Bishop of Debba, and Vicar Apostolic of the London District.

[CONTINUED FROM OUR LAST NUMBER.]

The events of the year 1745, involved the Catholics, in the London District in great distress. They were viewed with distrust and jealousy: several were imprisoned, most of their private Chapels were shut up, and with the single exception of the Bavarian Ambassador, the foreign ministers refused them admittance into their Chapels. In addition to these evils, the prisons were crowded with Scottish and English Catholics, of whom many were tried and executed; and those who interested themselves for the relief of any of them, became themselves objects of suspicion. Dr. Challoner was then the universal refuge; he obtained, for the sufferers, spiritual and temporal aid, and did it with a prudence that satisfied Government. The purse of Edward, Duke of Norfolk, was opened to him, and many other Catholics co-operated with him. The storm was short, but severe; and if it produced much misery, it produced heroic deeds, both of spiritual and temporal mercy.

In 1753, Dr. Challoner exerted himself to prevent so much of the Marriage Act, then brought into Parliament, from being enacted, as required the celebration of Marriage in Protestant Churches. These exertions, however, were fruitless: but he obtained the most explicit assurances, that the attendance of Catholics in Protestant Churches, on these occasions, was considered by Government and the public, not as an act of religious conformity, but as a form prescribed by law for the civil legality of the marriage. The Vicars Apostolic enjoined the Catholics not to join, externally or internally, in the prayers of the Protestant Minister, and to be married previously by the Priest. The Catholics conformed, with great reluctance, to these statutory provisions, and have now obtained their repeal. These provisions were never in force in Scotland, Ireland, or any of the British dominions in the East or West Indies.

In 1758, Dr. Petre died, after having governed the London District for 25 years, as Vicar Apostolic. By his death, the whole charge of that District devolved to Dr. Challoner. Sometime afterwards, being very ill, and the worst being apprehended, he petitioned His Holiness to have the Honourable James Talbot, a brother of the Earl of Shrewsbury, appointed his Coadjutor. The petition was immediately granted; Mr. Talbot was nominated Bishop of Birrha, with the right of succeeding Dr. Challoner, on the event of his decease.

With the reign of Charles II. the enactments which formed the sanguinary part of the Penal Code against the English Catholics finally closed. From the reign of William III. their situation was gradually ameliorated: yet even during his reign, and that of his successor, severe laws were enacted against them. The Act of Constructive Recusancy passed in the first year of George I. was that, which, after the accession of the House of Brunswick, they most sensibly felt. The punishment of recusancy was penal in the extreme, and persons might be subjected to all the horrors attendant on it, merely by refusing to take the oaths of allegiance, abjuration, and supremacy, when proposed to them. This statute had a silent, but dreadful operation. It left Catholics at the mercy of every one, who wished to injure or insult them. Frequently, they were withheld by it from asserting even those rights, which the law had left them. It depressed them so much below their legitimate rank in society, that they hardly entered with the look, or attitude of freemen, into the meetings of their Protestant neighbours. 'Such was their situation,' to use Mr. Burke's strong, but just expressions, 'that they not only shrunk from the frowns of a stern magistrate, but were obliged to fly from their very species; a kind of universal subserviency, that made the very servant behind their chair, the arbiter of their lives and fortunes.'

The reign of George II. was the first after the reformation, in which no law was enacted against the Catholics. But their Priests were often persecuted, sometimes imprisoned, and could only avoid these inflictions by departing out of the kingdom, or by removing to a remote corner of it.

At the time to which the subject has now brought us, Mr. Payne, a common informer, indicted several persons for assisting at Mass. The Lord Mayor, and the Bishop of London, discountenanced the proceedings, and juries were with great difficulty, induced to find the bills. After they were found, warrants were obtained against the persons indicted, and they were taken into custody. A prosecution was instituted against Dr. Challoner. But, from the difficulty of establishing, by proper evidence, the facts to be proved, and from the extreme unwillingness of juries and judges to convict, he and others escaped. This was not, however, always the case. One Priest, being convicted of saying Mass, was sentenced to perpetual imprisonment. Five others were tried in the Court of King's Bench, for saying Mass: the fact was proved, but their Counsel alleged, that, to establish the charge, it was necessary to prove, that what they said was Mass, and that they had, previously to their saying it been ordained Priests. As neither of these facts could be proved, the prisoners were acquitted. The same point was urged at the trial of another Priest before Lord Mansfield, who, in delivering his judgment at great length, said that

'all the twelve judges had been consulted on the point; and that they had all agreed in opinion, that the Statutes were so worded, that, in order to convict a man upon them, it was necessary that he should be first proved to be a Priest; and, secondly, that it should be proved, that he had said Mass.' Not disheartened by this defeat, Mr Payne indicted Dr Talbot, the Coadjutor of Dr Challoner, for saying Mass: he was tried at the Old Bailey, and escaped for want of evidence.

In the meantime, the double land tax continued to be levied; the laws, which deprived the Catholics of their landed property, for the sake of religion, were sometimes enforced, and, in other respects, the Catholics were subject to inconceivable hardships and contumely. In all these transactions, Dr. Challoner conducted himself with great prudence and firmness. Scanty as was his income, he was the chief refuge of the persecuted Priests. The expenses attending the prosecutions of them, their imprisonments, concealments, and other vexations, were almost always discharged by him: he defrayed them with kindness, and in a manner, that showed how greatly he honoured the sufferers in their sufferings and wants.

The last attempt to deprive Catholics of their landed property, on account of their religion, was made by a near Protestant relation of a Catholic Lady in the North of England, who attempted to deprive her of her jointure, under the Statute of the 10 and 11 William III. Her counsel found her case remediless at law. She procured a Bill, for her relief, to be brought into the House of Lords. Lord Camden, on reading her petition, declared himself an advocate of her cause; and, in the speech which he made on the occasion, was eminently great. When he spoke of the hardness of her case, the harshness of the laws which produced it, and the claims of the Catholics on the humanity of the House for their repeal, he was heard with an unanimous burst of applause; it sounded throughout the kingdom, and produced a corresponding sensation.

Availing themselves of this, and some circumstances which disposed the Government to favour them, the Catholics, in 1778, presented a petition to his Majesty. It was framed by Mr Burke, signed by the Duke of Norfolk and the Earl of Shrewsbury, and several English Commoners for the English; and by Lord Linton, and several Scottish Commoners for the Scots. It was graciously received. A bill was brought into the House by Sir George Saville, and passed both Houses without opposition.

The legal operation of this act was very limited. It repealed those clauses which disabled the Catholic from taking land by descent or purchase, and some other clauses, which related to the apprehension of Bishops and Priests, and subjected them to perpetual imprisonment. All the penalties and disabilities inflicted by other acts, still remained in full force. But the advantages which they derived from it in other respects, were both substantial and extensive. It shook the general prejudice against them, and led the public to view their pretensions to further relief, with a favourable eye. The boon was, however, burdened with an oath. Every such oath, so far as it required from Catholics a solemn profession of moral or civil principle not required from any other subject, was felt by them as an humiliation. Yet they acquiesced, and the oath was taken universally.

Although this Act passed both Houses of Parliament with unanimity, and, apparently at least, with the general applause of the nation; yet some associations were almost immediately formed, both in England and Scotland, to obtain its repeal. They ended in the Riots of 1780.* The first symptoms appeared in the close of the month of May; but the associators had, previously, often met; and the tone and proceedings of the meetings had long been a subject of alarm. After long scenes of devastation, a party of the rioters were proceeding to Dr. Challoner's house, about 11 o'clock at night, on Friday the

* See an account of the Riots, in the late Rev. Mr. Barnard's *Biographical Account of Dr. Challoner*.

2d of June. His Chaplains awakened him from his sleep, and persuaded him, with great difficulty, to retire to the house of a friend, in which, it was supposed, he would be in greater safety. The next day, he was conveyed to a gentleman's house, a few miles from London; but even there, he was not thought to be in sufficient security, and a still farther removal was contemplated; but he himself objected to it. In the midst of these trying scenes, he never lost his fortitude, his confidence in God, or the pious serenity of his mind. After a few days he was restored to his flock.

To the last, Dr. Challoner preserved all the faculties of his mind; attended to all the concerns of his District; received, instructed, and relieved the poor, and actively promoted all institutions, which appeared likely to promote charity or religion. After such a life, as he had led, he must be supposed to have met the approach of death, with a pious hope, that God, who had conferred on him so many graces through life, would not abandon him at his dissolution. To die well, had been the employment of his whole life.

On the 10th of January, 1781, whilst sitting at dinner, and conversing with his Chaplains, his right hand fell, on a sudden, from the table; he said he was seized with the palsy. He was conveyed to his bed, and medical assistance procured for him. Almost immediately afterwards, the palsy seized his right side, and also affected his speech in such a manner, that he was not, from that moment, heard to utter an intelligible word; yet he retained his reason to the very last, and the by-standers could evidently perceive his conviction that he had only a short time to live, and that his soul was occupied on God, and in making acts of devotion suitable to his situation. He received all the Sacraments of the Church. On the 12th of January, God was pleased, by another stroke of the palsy, to deliver him from this mortal life; and, we humbly trust, to receive him into the kingdom of heavenly bliss. His remains, with proper attendants, were conveyed to Milton, in Berkshire, and deposited in the Parish Church.

He had passed the 90th year of his age. Mr. Barnard, his biographer, informs us, that he was about five feet ten inches high, of a fair complexion, sharp penetrating eye, a serene and engaging countenance, having piety and devotion expressed in every lineament of his face, but emaciated by application to study and self-denial.

Dr. Challoner was the Author of numerous publications, The titles of those that are now in print, are here subjoined :

Think Well On't. *Written at Doway College.*

Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine, contained in the Profession of Faith of Pope Pius V. 1732.

A short History of the first beginning and progress of the Protestant Religion, gathered out of the best Protestant Writers. 1733.

A Roman Catholic's Reasons why he cannot conform to the Protestant Religion 1733.

The Touchstone of the New Religion. 1734.

The Young Gentleman instructed in the Grounds of his Religion. 1733.

A Catholic Christian Instructed in the Sacraments, Sacrifice, Ceremonies and Observances of the Catholic Religion. 1737.

Memoris of the Missionary Priests, and other persons, of both sexes, who have suffered death or imprisonment in England, on account of their Religion, from the year 1577, till the end of the reign of Charles II. 1741.

The Grounds of the Old Religion. 1742.

Meditations for every Day in the Year. 1753.

A Caveat against the Methodists. 1760.

The Morality of the Gospel. 1762.

The Devotion of Catholics to the Virgin Mary truly stated. 1764.

Abstract of the History of the Old and New Testament. 1767.

The Garden of the Soul. 1767.

Translations of the Imitation of Christ. 1744.

Confessions of S. Augustine.

Introduction to a Devout Life, by S. Francis of Sales. 1762.

Of Boudon's Treatise, 'God alone.' 1766.

'God every where present.' 1766.

The Papist Misrepresented and Represented; abridged from Mr. Gother.

CHEERFULNESS.

No man of matured mind, sensible of the slight tenure by which he retains life from one moment to another, and of the consequences which its termination involves, can, in fact, ever be truly cheerful, unless he be at the same time conscious that to the best of his power he has endeavoured to win the protection of the Omnipotent. That is a cheerfulness which requires no excitement from wine or music, which declines no entertainment in itself innocent, and which looks always upon the fair earth and the heavens above it, with a glow of rapture altogether unknown to the fanatic, who is led to suppose that religion cannot exist without gloom. We think if we make the people rest from all bodily movement on Sunday, except compelling them to fill the churches; if we close against them all other places of resort, unless it be the gin-shops, that we shall make them moral and consequently happy. We are egregiously wrong. I grant we may make them hypocrites or drunkards. We certainly are the only nation in the world, which in town and country looks sad on the Sabbath day. If we think we are a more virtuous and more moral people than the Austrians we are still further in error; and I believe there is far more intoxication and more iniquity committed within the closed doors of London on one Sunday, day and night together, than during the whole year in Vienna.—*Dublin Review.*

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Whoever remembers that the Catholic communion numbers in its ranks more than one hundred millions of souls, probably more than all other Christian churches together, must shudder at the sentence of proscription which has sometimes been passed on this immense portion of human beings. It is time that greater justice were done to this ancient and wide-spread community. The Catholic church has produced some of the greatest and best men that ever lived; and this is proof enough of its possessing all the means of salvation. Who, that hears the tone of contempt in which it is sometimes named, would suspect that Charlemagne, Alfred, Raphael, Michael, Angelo, Tasso, Bossuet, Pascal, and Des Cartes were Catholics. Some of the greatest names in arts and arms, on the throne and in the pulpit, were worn by Catholics. To come down to our own time, has not the metropolis of New-England witnessed a sublime example of Christian virtue in a Catholic bishop? Who, among our religious teachers, would solicit a comparison between himself and the devoted Cheverus? This good man, whose virtues and talents have now raised him to high dignities in church and state, who now wears in his own country the joint honours of an archbishop and a peer, lived in the midst of us, devoting his days and nights, and his whole heart, to the service of a poor and uneducated congregation. We saw him declining, in a great degree, the society of the cultivated and refined, that he might be the friend of the ignorant and friendless; leaving the circles of polished life, which he would have graced, for the meanest hovels; bearing, with a father's sympathy, the burdens and sorrows of his large and spiritual family; charging himself alike with their temporal and spiritual concerns; and never discovering, by the faintest indication, that he felt his fine mind degraded by his seemingly humble office. This good man, bent on his errands of mercy, was seen in our streets under the most burning sun of summer, and the fiercest storms of winter, as if armed against the elements by the power of charity. He has left us, but not to be forgotten. He enjoys among us what to such a man must be dearer than fame. His name is cherished, where the great of this world are unknown. It is pronounced with blessings, with grateful tears, with sighs for his return, in many an abode of sorrow and want; and how can we shut our hearts against this proof of the power of the Catholic religion to form good and great men?—*Dr. Channing's Literary and Political Essays.*

FLOWERS FROM THE HOLY FATHERS.

XI.

Coelum altius est imbrisbus ac pluvias, nubibus obducitur, sed nihil patitur; sic nostri putamur pati, nihil patimur, tristitia quasi nubibus obduci putamur, sed non tristamur.—*Sti. Johan. Chrysostom. Hom. 1. in Ep. Cor. 2.*

Dark clouds, where storms and tempests reign,
May gloom awhile the face of earth,
And yet above Heaven's blue serene
Smiles in perpetual mirth.

So here the Christian soul awhile
May be o'ercast with sorrow's gloom,
But yet there is a heavenly smile
Looks on them from beyond the tomb.

Affliction's sting may wound thee here,
And proud ascendants lavish gall:
But faith's keen eye beyond the bier
Looks out and sees an end of all.

There, in the deep serene of heaven,
No clouds shall come, no grief invade,
Not tempest scowl,—and there no leaven
Of earthly haze o'ercast a shade.

There beckoning on, sweet peace and love
Point to the just, the happy road
That through affliction leads above,
And thorny paths to heaven and God.

THE ONE HOLY, CATHOLIC, AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH.

O, Holy Church of Rome! sublime and pure,—
Safe is thy Rock, thy doctrines how secure!
Thy sacred Founder, with almighty hand,
Thy deep foundations laid, and bade thee stand,
Firm and unyielding, to remotest time;
In every age the same, in every clime.
Two thousand years have nearly wing'd their flight,
And sunk into the oblivious womb of night,
Since first thy Maker fix'd thee on thy Rock,
And bade thee brave hell's never-ceasing shock:—
And yet thou stand'st unblemished, holy! fair,
As when thy Builder first thy dome did rear!
Nor shalt thou fail, though factious men may rage,
And, leagued with hell, eternal warfare wage:
Thy walls of adamant shall stand secure,
Whilst earth and heaven, and sun and moon endure.
The weapons form'd against thee nought prevail;
Shatter'd they fall, like leaves before the gale.
Christ's holy Church, his spotless spouse art thou;
Then what can mar the beauty of thy brow?
Not Slander's breath, nor Envy's fiery brand,
For Christ, the Lord, doth lead thee by the hand,

E. HAWKLEY.

Sydney, N. S. Wales, Sept. 3, 1838.

Printed by Messrs. W. Rushton and Co., Calcutta, for the Proprietors
price one rupee per month, or ten rupees per annum in advance. To non-
subscribers 8 annas per number.

THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

'One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.'

NO. XVIII.

NOVEMBER 2, 1839.

VOL. I.

A CLEAR EXPOSITION OF THE FOUR CHARACTER- ISTICS OF THE TRUE CHURCH.

(Continued from No. XV.)

Our Church is CATHOLIC. It is manifest that unity is essential to Catholicity or Universality of faith, because no faith can be called universal, unless it be one and the same throughout all the regions, in which it is diffused. Hence the fundamental principle of Protestantism excludes Catholicity, because every Protestant has a right to interpret the word of God as his reason dictates, and consequently may have a religion peculiar to himself, so that it is utterly impossible that Protestantism can be one and the same every where; and therefore it cannot be Catholic. It is true that all heterodox sects are denominated Protestants, and thus give rise to the vague idea of universality attached to the Protestant religion, but when we consider the multifarious nature of the latter, we discover that it is not one universal religion, but a compound mixture of numberless sects, each of which is discordant with the others. In truth this fact of Protestantism being diffused through many countries, but not being Catholic, only evinces the *negative* nature of that religion, since to be a Protestant, nothing positive is required; it is only necessary to *protest* against some point of the Catholic faith. But the Catholic religion is every where identical; it is the same in China as it is in America,—the same in the Turkish capital as in the Roman metropolis. No discrepancy of tenets is allowed; whoever of its professors pertinaciously maintains any doctrine repugnant to its dogmas, ceases to be a Catholic, and is instantly cut off from the body of the Church. Our heterodox brethren themselves acknowledge that the Roman Church of the first five centuries was the only true one; that the doctrines of her ancient Fathers were those revealed by God. Now the Centuriators of Magdeburgh admit that our dogmas are identical with those of the Fathers alluded to; therefore they should confess that they are the doctrines of the Church of Christ; but to elude this logical conclusion, they aver that those doctrines in the Fathers were stains, and in us are heresies. Calvin openly professes himself ready to refute the doc-

trines universally held in the primitive Church. He avows that Purgatory, Prayers for the dead, &c., were dogmas of the first ages, and still he expunges them from the body of revelation. He does not admit the authority of Fathers, Pontiffs, or Councils, with the exception of Augustine alone. 'Let all,' he writes (Inst. lib. 3, cap. 3), 'learn from Austin alone, if they are anxious to know the genuine sense of antiquity.' But in the same book, chapter 11th, he subjoins, 'not even Austin's opinion is to be followed in all things.' Is this consistency? Modern innovators imitate Calvin. These, in all their works and discussions, have 'Augustine' on their pen and on their tongue; but as in 'Augustine' there are texts too forcibly directed against their errors, they also exclaim, 'Austin's opinion is not always to be followed.' They, therefore, implicitly avow that their dogmas are not those of the primitive Church.

Furthermore, we clearly point out the precise period of the rise of those sects. We show that Arianism commenced in Egypt A. D. 324, Nestorianism in Thrace, A. D. 431, Lutheranism in Saxony, A. D. 1517, and so on with the others. Moreover we know that the greatest portion of heresies are extinct, and as Augustine says, 'They have flowed in their beds, as long as they could; the beds are dried up, there is scarcely any recollection left of them.' The schools of Florinus, Novatus, Proclus, of the Pepuzenians, and of the Lampetians are hardly known to have ever existed. Teodoret, in his *Heretical fables*, makes mention of SEVENTY-SIX different sects, and testifies that at his time (A. D. 430,) they were almost extinct. St. Austin, in his book *On Heresies*, enumerates EIGHTY-EIGHT, and elsewhere he declares that there was no further trace of them. Bellarmine, up to Luther's time, counts 200 heresiarchs. They had many followers; they reckoned Prelates, Princes, Kings and Emperors in their train; their arsenals were stocked with arms, and their libraries with books to support their doctrines. At present, with the exception of a few Nestorians and Eutychians in the East, and of Hussites in Bohemia, 'there is scarcely any recollection left of them.' Who would have ever expected the extinction of the Albigenses, a sect that made so much noise in France? Who that of the Arians, who at the times of Hilary and Athanasius seemed to threaten destruction to the whole earth?—Descending to our own times, the majority of Lutherans deserted to the side of Zuinglius: Calvin rose up against the latter, and found followers: the Reformers then split into a hundred fragments, whence sprang the Libertines in France, the Puritans and Presbyterians in Great Britain, the Trinitarians in Poland, the Samosatians in Transylvania, and the Jansenists in divers parts of Europe. So much so, that the Lutherans and Calvinists themselves have so altered the doctrines of their masters, that if Luther and Calvin were to rise from their graves, they would not recognize them for their disciples!

(To be continued.)

ECCLESIASTICAL INTELLIGENCE.—Latest advices from Germany state, that the glorious Confessor of our Faith, and upholder of the rights of our Church against Prussian despotism, the Archbishop of Cologne, has been released from his imprisonment in the murderous fortress, of Minden, in consequence of the impaired state of his health, and permitted to reside in one of his country-seats near Munster, the capital of Westphalia.

CONVERSION.—On the authority of a highly respectable correspondent, we have the pleasure to inform our readers, that on the 20th of September last, ROBERT REYNEL ESQUIRE, abjured Protestantism and embraced the Catholic Faith, in the Chapel at Midnapore, in the presence of the Reverend Mr. Gradoly, and of a number of persons who witnessed the ceremony.

CANADA.—We feel great pleasure in giving a prominent place to the following testimony of the loyalty and zeal of the Catholic Clergy of Canada, taken from the 'Report of the Affairs of British North America from the EARL of DURHAM; Her Majesty's High Commissioner, &c., and presented to Parliament by Her Majesty's command.

'The French Canadians (observes Lord Durham) are exclusively Catholics, and their church has been left in possession of the endowments which it had at the conquest. The right to tithe is enjoyed by their priests; but as it is limited by law to lands of which the proprietor is a Catholic, the priest loses his tithe the moment that an estate passes, by male or otherwise, into the hands of a Protestant. This enactment, which is at variance with the true spirit of national endowments for religious purposes, has a natural tendency to render the clergy averse to the settlement of Protestants in the seigniories. But the Catholic priesthood of this province have, to a very remarkable degree, conciliated the good will of persons of all creeds; and a zealous discharge of their clerical duties is more universally admitted, and has been productive of more beneficial consequences. Possessed of incomes sufficient, and even large, according to the notions entertained in the country, and enjoying the advantage of education, they have lived on terms of equality and kindness with the humblest and least instructed inhabitants of the rural districts. Intimately acquainted with the wants and characters of their neighbours, they have been the promoters and dispensers of charity, and the effectual guardians of the morals of the people; and, in the general absence of any permanent institutions of civil government, the Catholic church has presented almost the only semblance of stability and organization, and furnished the only effectual support for civilization and order. The Catholic clergy of Lower Canada are entitled to this expression of my esteem, not only because it is founded in truth, but because a grateful recognition of their eminent services, in resisting the arts of the disaffected, is especially due to them from one who has administered the government of the province in these troubled times. The endowments of the Catholic church, and the services of its numerous and zealous parochial clergy, have been of the greatest benefit to the large body of Catholic emigrants from Ireland, who have relied much on the charitable as well as religious aid which they have received from the priesthood. The priests have an almost unlimited influence over the lower classes of Irish: and this influence is said to have been very vigorously exerted last winter, when it was much needed, to secure the loyalty of a portion of the Irish during the troubles. The general loyalty exhibited by the Irish settlers in the Canadas during the last winter, and the importance of maintaining it unimpaired in future times of difficulty, render it of the utmost moment that the feelings and interests of the Catholic clergy and population should invariably meet with due consideration from the government.'

We invite the attention of our readers to the first of a series of articles signed SAGITTARIUS taken from the *London Orthodox Journal* for the present year, and which we are persuaded, will be read with peculiar interest when it is known that the writer is a distinguished convert to Catholicity. The letter signed VERAX, which is also the first of a series and written as we understand by a convert, will we doubt not be found both interesting and instructive.

THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE'S METHOD OF RE-CLAIMING PAPISTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—I beg to offer you a little of what every one is more ready to give than to take: Advice. I would then recommend your transferring to your pages the most racy of the attacks on 'Popery' which make their hebdomadal appearance in the *Christian Advocate*; so that your popish readers may see with what powerful and honourable weapons their creed is attacked. In my humble opinion the *Christian Advocate* is more likely to make Papists (I use the nick-name to humour him,) than the *Expositor*. For of all the advocates I ever saw or heard of, he is the best calculated to convince thinking people the other way. Assuredly nothing tends more strongly to confirm Catholics in their faith, than to see the dishonest expedients to which its enemies are compelled to resort, in order to make out any thing like a plausible case against it.

The *Advocate* having signally failed in his attempt to prove, independently of the testimony of the Fathers and the Church, that the scriptures are the inspired word of God, now endeavours, by keeping up a desultory and ineffective fire against Popery, as he politely designates the Catholic religion, to divert attention from the untenableness of his own position. With this view he rakes up all the filth and falsehood that have been invented as justificatory pretexts during three centuries of persecution, and puts them forth as if they had never been refuted; and, as if this were not enough, he has pressed the false and ridiculous rhapsodies of the notorious Joseph Wolff, into his service. Those who remember the exhibition which Joe made of himself in this City about six years ago, the exposure which Captain, now Sir Alexander Burnes, made of his falsehoods and tergiversations, his assertion—*that he had cast out many devils—that our Blessed Saviour appeared several times to him—that the prophet Elija had travelled three days with him through the desert. And that Mahomet was a true Prophet of God, &c.* will know what value to attach to Joe's veracity. It will, however, answer the *Advocate's* purpose; with him no evidence is bad against popery.

A very pathetic account is given of the cause of Joe's leaving the Propaganda which cannot fail to move the sympathy of the Biblicals. Joe is wise in his generation, and knew full well that nothing could give him more favor with Protestants than to make them believe that he was a victim to his zeal for the Scriptures. The fact is he had been guilty of some irregularities of conduct which it would not have answered his purpose to mention. He states, doubtless with the view of gulling his new friends, a number of things which he could not but have known to be untrue: Such for example as where he says that there are seven degrees of ordination and that *one of them empowers the ordained person to release Souls from Purgatory!!! And that the Pope is called God!!!* That priests have power to release souls from Purgatory is a piece of information for which I am entirely indebted to Joe Wolff; but the assertion that we call the Pope, God, is about 200 years old, and quite as true as most things that are alleged against us. The appellation of

'*Dominus Deus noster Papa*' is a forgery. In the original it is '*Dominus noster Papa*,' the usual appellation still in the Roman states. But some wag of a disputant chose to quote it with the interposition of *Deus*, and, though the falsification was exposed, yet bigots still adhere to the old fiction. Some time ago the *Advocate* quoted Bellarmine in order to convince his readers that that great divine had maintained that the Pope could make virtue vice and vice virtue; now Bellarmine maintained precisely the contrary. But it suited the *Advocate's* purpose to make him state as a direct argument what he in fact starts as an objection, and an argument *ex absurdo*. Well might an eminent Protestant divine exclaim:—'Forgery, I blush for the honor of Protestantism while I write it, seems to have been the peculiar disease of the *Reformed*! I look in vain for one of those accursed outrages of imposition among the disciples of Popery.' But how would Whitaker have blushed had he seen the shameless perversions of truth, which disfigure the pages of the Misnamed *Christian Advocate*, who seemingly cannot quote without falsifying. In the last number a quotation from St. Ireneus is most grossly, and shamefully falsified. The word '*jointly*' is three times used, and in capitals, and the word '*two*,' once, though neither is to be found in the original. The quotation is advanced for the purpose of disproving the Supremacy of the Roman See. Now St. Ireneus states in the very same place whence the *Advocate* has taken the quotation, which he has garbled and falsified, to suit his purpose,—'that the Church of Rome is the greatest, the most ancient and known of all for to this Church, on account of its chief presidentship, it is necessary that every Church, that is, the faithful every where, address themselves, in which Church the tradition from the Apostles is every where preserved.' So much for the *Advocate's* honesty in quoting the Fathers. Is it by such means that he expects to seduce Catholics from the one fold of the One Shepherd?

A LAYMAN.

BALLS AND DANCES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—It was with much pleasure that I read in your fourteenth number, a short article, entitled '*Dancing and Christians*,' with the signature of AU REVOIR.

I was particularly pleased to see, how clearly and briefly your correspondent pointed out, both the absurdities into which those fall, who in interpreting Holy Writ, take no other guide than their own spirit, and the shameful manner in which such persons abuse the word of God, to make it favour their own fancies. I observed, however, with regret, that the writer seemed afraid to declare what are the principles, commonly admitted among Catholics on the subject of balls and dances. I will not presume to supply the omission, especially as it has been treated with so much prudence and discretion by the holy and learned Bishop of Geneva, St. Francis of Sales. You would therefore oblige me, by inserting, in your journal, for the instruction of your readers, his chapter On Balls and Pastimes, which are lawful but dangerous.

I remain, Sir, your's most sincerely,

A WELL-WISHER.

‘ Although balls and dancing be recreations in their own nature indifferent, yet according to the ordinary manner in which they are conducted, they preponderate very much on the side of evil, and are in consequence extremely dangerous. Being generally carried on in the darkness and obscurity of night, it is by no means surprising that several vicious circumstances should obtain easy admittance, since the subject is of itself so susceptible of evil. The amateurs of these diversions, by setting up late at night, disable themselves from discharging their duty to God on the morning of the day following. Is it not then a kind of madness to exchange day for night, light for darkness, and good works for criminal fooleries? Every one strives who shall carry most vanity to the ball; and vanity is so congenial, as well to evil affections as to dangerous familiarities, that both are easily engendered by dancing.

I have the same opinion of dances, Philothea, as physicians have of mushrooms; the best of mushrooms, in their opinion, are good for nothing; in the same way, I tell you, the best ordered balls are good for nothing. If, nevertheless, you must eat mushrooms, be sure that they be well-dressed.

If, upon some occasion which you cannot well avoid, you must go to a ball, see that your dancing be properly accommodated. But you will ask me, how must it be accommodated? I answer with modesty, dignity, and a good intention. Eat but sparingly and seldom of mushrooms, say the physicians, for be they ever so well dressed, the quantity makes them poisonous: dance but little, and very seldom, I say, lest otherwise you put yourself in danger of contracting an affection for dancing.

Mushrooms, according to Pliny, being spongy and porous, easily attract infection to themselves, from the things that are about them; so that being near serpents and toads, they imbibe their poison. Balls, dancing, and other nocturnal meetings, ordinarily attract the reigning vices and sins together—namely, quarrels, envy, scoffing, and wanton loves; and as these exercises open the pores of the bodies of those that use them, so they also open the pores of their heart, and expose them to the danger of some serpent, which may take advantage to breathe some loose words, or lascivious suggestions into the ear, or of some basilisk, that may cast an impure look, or wanton glance of love into the heart, which being thus opened, is easily seized upon and poisoned. O Philothea, these idle recreations are ordinarily very dangerous; they chase away the spirit of devotion, and leave the soul in a languishing condition; they cool the fervour of charity, and excite a thousand evil affections in the soul, and therefore they are not to be used but with the greatest caution.

But physicians say, that after mushrooms, we must drink good wine; and I say, that after dancing, it is necessary to refresh our souls with some good and holy considerations, to prevent the baneful effects of those dangerous impressions which the vain pleasure taken in dancing may have left in our minds. 1st.—Consider, that during the time you were at the ball, innumerable souls were burning in the flames of Hell, for the sins they had committed in dancing, or were occasioned by their dances. 2nd.—That many religious and devout persons of both sexes were at that very time in the presence of God, singing his praises, and contemplating his beauty. Ah! how much more profitably was their time employed than yours! 3rd.—That whilst you were dancing, many souls departed out of this world in great anguish, and that thousands of thousands of men and women were

then suffering great pains in their beds, in hospitals, in the streets, by the gout, the stone, or burning fevers. Alas ! they had no rest ; and will you have no compassion for them ? and do not you think that you shall one day groan as they did, whilst others shall dance as you did. 4th.—That our blessed Saviour, his virgin mother, the angels and saints, beheld you at the ball. Ah ! how greatly did they pity you, seeing your heart pleased with so vain an amusement, and taken up with such childish toys ! 5th.—Alas ! whilst you were there, time was passing away, and death was approaching nearer : behold how he mocks you, and invites you to his dance, in which the groans of your friends and relations shall serve for the music, and where you shall make but one step from this life to the next.

The dance of death, is, alas ! the true pastime of mortals, since by it we instantly pass from the vain amusements of this world, to the eternal pains or pleasures of the next. I have set you down these little considerations : God will suggest to you many more to the like effect, provided you fear him.

Now, if you ask at what time you may play or dance, the same saint will answer you in these terms. In order that playing and dancing may be lawful, we must use them by way of recreation, without having any affection for them ; we may use them for a short time, but not till we are wearied or stupified with them ; and we must use them but seldom, lest, we should otherwise turn a recreation into an occupation. But on what occasions may we lawfully play and dance ? Just occasions of innocent games are frequent, whilst those of hazard are rare, on account of their being more blameable and dangerous : wherefore, in one word, dance and play according to the conditions specified above, as your prudence and discretion may direct you, to comply by charity with the civil request of the company in which you are engaged ; for condescension, as a branch of charity, makes indifferent things good, and dangerous things allowable ; it even takes away the harm from those things that are in some measure evil ; and therefore games of hazard, which otherwise would be reprehensible, are not so, if we use them by a just and christian condescension.

I was very much pleased to read in the life of St. Charles Boromeus, how he charitably condescended with the Swiss, in certain things, in which otherwise he was very strict ; and that St. Ignatius of Loyola, being invited to play, complied with the request in his zeal for the conversion of a sinner. St. Elizabeth of Hungary also, played and danced (sometimes,) when she was present at assemblies of recreation, without any prejudice to her devotion ; for devotion was so deeply rooted in her soul, that as the rocks about the lake of Rietta grow greater by the beating of the waves, so her devotion increased among the pomps and vanities to which her condition exposed her. Great fires increase by the wind, but little ones are soon blown out, if we carry them uncovered.

The Lancaster Guardian states that Dr. Lingard has been elected a member of the French Academy of Sciences, an honour which, it will be remembered, was conferred upon Lord Brougham, on his recent visit to the French capital. This generous mark of appreciation of Dr. Lingard's historical labours reflects equal credit on the worthy Doctor and on the learned body whose spontaneous vote thus confirm and establish his continental reputation.

Selections.

CURIOSITIES OF LITERATURE BEFORE THE PSEUDO- REFORMATION.

(*From the London Orthodox Journal.*)

NO. I.

THE MATERIAL AND INSTRUMENTS EMPLOYED IN WRITING.

‘Pavilioned in the glittering pride of our superficial accomplishments and upstart pretensions, we fancy that every thing beyond that magic circle is prejudice and error ; and all, before the present enlightened period, but a dull and useless blank in the great map of time.’—*Hazlitt.*

Our readers, who are much given to ‘solitary musings,’ must be well aware that there is no position more favourable to a ‘brown study’ than to be seated in an elbow chair with the eyes staring fixedly between the second and third bar of a dimly burning fire. If a favourite dog, his crop full like Milton’s goblin, lies basking his hairy strength on the hearth, and a pet cat sits purring at your feet, the luxury of your situation will be increased. Often when our eyes have grown dim with poring over the ‘Summa’ of St. Thomas or the Commentaries of St. Augustine, have we thrown ourself back in our chair and tried to fancy the study and library of those venerable sages, whose works we had just closed. We have felt a sort of curiosity to know the edition, size, and binding of the Bible which formed their daily study. Was it ‘a very handsome diamond Bible,’ like that which Mr. Finch, ‘amidst shouts of laughter,’ once produced in the House of Commons to test the correctness of a quotation ; or was it of more portly dimensions, like that which was carried about in the carriage of Lord Sandon, during the elections, as a sop to the bigotry of Liverpool ; or was it of Belgian make, short and dumpy, with a strong oaken back and secured by a goodly iron clasp ? We have no doubt our readers often have had similar imaginings. To gratify their curiosity and clear up their doubts, we will devote this paper to an account of the manner in which books were got up before the invention of printing.

In the early ages of the world, blocks of stone, wood, brass, lead, the leaves and bark of trees were used by mankind to perpetuate their sentiments to posterity. The laws given to Moses on Mount Sinai were engraven on two tables of stone ; the laws of the twelve tables among the Romans on brass ; and the laws of Solon, at Athens, on tablets of wood. Covered with wax, tablets of wood were in common use among the ancients : as a pen, a style of metal, ivory, or bone was used. Such were the copy books used by boys at school : they possessed equal advantages with our slates, inasmuch as mistakes could be easily erased. When in great haste, tablets were preferred to paper, as it was not necessary to raise the hand to acquire a fresh supply of ink. These tablets were used till a very late period. In the year 1395, a tablet covered with green wax was kept in the chapel of Winchester, for noting down with a style the respective courses of daily or weekly portions of duty alternately assigned to the officers of the choir. In the town-hall of Hanover are still kept twelve wooden tablets covered with wax, on which are inscribed the names of the owners of houses in the city. From using the bark of trees arose the word *book*, for *boc* in Anglo-Saxon means a beech tree, the bark of which was most generally used. A curious library of this description has been discovered among the Calmucs. The leaves were composed of thick bark varnished over and the writing, the reverse of ours, was white on a black ground. We read in the ‘Chronicles of the Ages of Faith,’ that St. Liudger, when a

child, used to make imitations of books with the bark of trees, and with them to form a little library. To show how the amusements of the boy often influence the pursuits of the man, we may add that he afterwards travelled to many countries, and among other places to the city of York, to attend the lectures of Alcuin, under whom he studied three years and a half. From the use of the leaves of trees to write on arises the application of the word leaves to our books. Every classical scholar will remember the prophecies of the Cumvian Sybil, described as written on leaves, and then borne on the wings of the wind to distant provinces and nations.

Linen cloth was the next material used for writing: the letters were drawn or painted on it with pencils. This substance was generally employed by the Egyptians to inshroud their mummies. The skins of animals, especially of sheep, goats, and asses, were next employed; but they were very rudely prepared and scarcely deserve the name of parchment. Among the treasures in the library of Constantinople, there was a long roll of 100 or 120 feet long, made of the intestines of a dragon or serpent, on which Homer's *Illiad* and *Odyssey* were written in letters of gold: it perished by fire in the sixth century. In the coffer of the black Jews in Malaga, there is an ancient copy of the law, written on a roll of leather or skins, fifteen feet long. From the fact of ancient books thus consisting of a long roll, is derived the word *volume*, which, in Latin, means a folding, rolling, or coiling.

Parchment or vellum, which was a finer kind of parchment, made from the skins of young calves, was the principal material employed during the ages of faith. A better substance for writing on could not possibly be imagined; it is of firm and fine texture, having a smooth and polished surface. The pumice stone is supposed to have been employed in polishing it. When gold or silver letters were to be employed the parchment was tinged with a purple or violet colour; but the natural colour, sometimes tinged yellow on one side, was most commonly employed.

Paper made from the *papyrus*, a species of rush, growing on the banks of rivers in the East, was in very general use among the ancients. From a very early date manufactories of it were established in Egypt, on the bank of whose river, the Nile, it was supposed exclusively to grow. The fibrous parts of the rush were cut into slices, which were placed on a table, one layer across another; water from the Nile was then poured on to dissolve the saccharine or glutinous matter contained in the plant. When the layers were joined so as to form one piece, they were dried, sized, beaten with a mallet, sized again, pressed, and subsequently polished with a tooth, shell, bone, or other smooth substance. The water of the Nile was erroneously supposed to have a glutinous property; any other water would have done as well, since the viscous matter existed in the rush, not in the water. The paper thus formed was weak and brittle: to give it strength and durability, leaves of parchment were intermixed. When the Saracens, who were fonder of the sword than of the pen, gained possession of Egypt, the manufacture and exportation of paper was greatly diminished. To compensate, however, for the loss, a superior method of making paper from cotton was discovered. In the thirteenth century, the use of cotton paper was superseded by that of linen, which is the substance still employed in our paper manufactories. Manufacturing England, till within the last hundred years, received her principal supply of fine paper from the Continent.

We shall close our article with a few observations on the instruments used in writing. What we have said on the material is intended to provoke, rather than to gratify curiosity. The instruments depended on the nature of the material. For engraving on stone, wood, ivory, brass, lead, and other hard substances, a chisel would be used. On the introduction of parchment and paper, reeds were employed. They were slit and sharpened either with a knife or on stone: the use of the style was not, however, discontinued. At Trinity College, Cambridge, is a *Psalter* in Latin and Saxon, admirably written, and illuminated with letters in gold, silver, miniated, &c.

It is full of a variety of historical pictures. At the end is the figure of the writer, Eaduin, a monk of Canterbury, holding a pen of metal : an undoubted proof that the style, fashioned somewhat like our modern steel pens, was then employed. The species of reed, used as pens by the ancients, and during the ages of faith, is not now known : yet we must not imagine that modern ingenuity introduced the use of the 'grey goose quill.' It was introduced as early as the eighth century, and we read that in 1433 a present of a bundle of quills was sent from Venice with a letter, in which the writer said : 'shew the bundle to brother Nicholas, that he may choose a quill.'

That the ink employed by the much calumniated monks was superior to ours, is abundantly evident from the manner in which it has kept its colour during so many centuries. It is as fresh, as black, and as solid as if it had just been laid on. Besides black, red, blue, purple, silver, and gold inks were also extensively used. Modern chemistry, with all its boasted improvements and discoveries, has, as yet, discovered nothing superior, or even equal to these compositions, for unfading durability. The basis of black ink was soot, lamp black, or burnt ivory. From an examination of the manuscripts, and from an inkstand discovered in Herculaneum, their ink would seem to have been much thicker, more opaque, and more encaustic than ours. Red ink was formed from vermilion, cinnabar, and carmine; from the murex, a species of shellfish, was formed purple. We have now completed our self-imposed task, and would that the skill of the engraver could transfer to our pages the representation of a holy and learned friar, such as they are represented on ancient manuscripts, engaged with patient and unwearied industry in the laborious office of transcription. Around him would be depicted the instruments of his art : a sponge to cleanse his reed and erase mistakes, like the gaudy cloth butterfly and caoutchouc of the modern student ; a knife of stone for mending his reed pen ; a pumice stone or piece of bone for smoothening the parchment ; scissors for cutting and trimming the paper ; compasses for measuring the distance of lines ; a puncher to point out the beginning and end of each line ; a rule to draw lines and divide the sheet into columns ; a glass with sand, and another with water, to dilute the ink, or for dipping the sponge in when requisite. Such would be the apparatus of one engaged in transcribing manuscripts. But we must conclude. Our candle is flickering in its socket ; its flame is struggling for another brief moment's existence ; another effort—it sinks—it rises—another bright flash and all is over : darkness reigns around. How like the struggles of a dying man : both struggle for another moment's existence ; both burn brightly for a brief period before their light dies away : the death rattle gurgles in the throat, the candle falls into the socket, and all is over.

SAGITTARIUS.

Mount Pleasant.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

(From the Madras Roman Catholic Expositor.)

OUR readers will no doubt be happy to learn that a weekly periodical entitled the 'BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR,' has been set on foot in Calcutta, having for its primary object the defence of Catholic Doctrines. Assailed as the Catholic Religion is by the united efforts of Sects of a thousand denominations, it is gratifying to observe that a Catholic periodical has arisen to explain the doctrines of an insulted Church. There can be no doubt that a great deal of good must result from the labours of the individual who has undertaken the meritorious task of undeceiving those who have been led astray by the calumnies of hirelings.

If British India had heretofore the same facilities we now possess, of repelling the foul charges so gratuitously and artfully heaped on us by our separated brethren : the dull reign of bigotry would have never set in or soon would have

terminated, and we might now boast of a more enlightened and peaceable order of things:—But the Catholic Clergy of earlier times came out here not to contend with heterodox doctrines but to convert the heathen, and totally unacquainted as they were with the English language, it was not possible for them to counteract the pernicious tendency of those multitudinous tracts which were scattered through the country for the sole object of poisoning the public mind and disfiguring the doctrines of the Catholic Religion. It is however surprising that under such disadvantages few comparatively fell off from the true faith.

That our readers may form an estimate of the views and talent of our Contemporary, we insert the first article of his journal: but whilst we admire the Expositor and applaud the writers, we regret that they are not matched with adversaries of a higher class who might give a better opportunity for reasoning and triumph.—*August, 1839.*

ON THE SACRAMENTS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

LETTER I.

To the Lord Bishop of Exeter.

MY LORD BISHOP,—As I consider your Lordship to be the most talented Divine that the Anglican Church can this day boast of, I therefore purpose to address a Series of Letters to you, (through the *Orthodox Journal*) on points in dispute between the Catholic and Protestant churches, when, after a full and clear investigation, the public will be able to see, on which side truth reclines. The subject of this letter is on the Sacraments, and I shall commence by saying, that, it is a principle of Protestancy, as well as of Popery, that Christ alone has the power of instituting Sacraments, because he alone can appoint proper channels to convey his grace to our souls. If Protestancy, which allows but of two Sacraments, was the religion taught by the apostles and established in the infancy of the church, I leave any man of common sense to judge whether five NEW ones, never heard of in the time of the apostles, could have been afterwards imposed upon the church, and rendered an article of her faith, without the greatest difficulty and the most vigorous opposition, at least for some time. Would not every good Protestant Bishop have immediately stood in the gap, and cried out against such a monstrous innovation? Would they not have written against it, and alledged that Christ had instituted but two Sacraments,—that the apostles had never preached but two,—that the number precisely of two, and no more, had been handed down to them by the immediate successors of the apostles; and that, therefore, no *human power* could make any addition to it, without impiety and sacrilege? Finally, would they not have stigmatized the first authors of such an innovation, and cut them off from the communion of the Church? It is certainly most rational to judge that the bishops and pastors then in being, if they were of the religion which Protestants now profess, would have exerted their utmost zeal and authority in a case of that importance, unless they were all asleep or doated; and therefore knew nothing of the matter; for no man hitherto has ever heard or read one word of any opposition or resistance made to the coining of any one of the five Sacraments, which are now denied by Protestants, or, of any disturbance that has ever happened in the Church about it. Very strange! that such a change should either happen without noise or trouble; or, if there were disturbances about it, that no historian should give us any information regarding it! I should be glad to know, my Lord Bishop, by what secret charm the Mass got admittance into the Universal Church, if it were neither instituted by Christ nor introduced by the practice of the Apostles themselves. For, if the Popish doctrine relating to it, viz. ‘That it is a true sacrifice, or, an external oblation of the real body and blood of Christ under the forms of bread and wine, ordained by Christ himself at his last supper;’ if

this, I say, be false doctrine, we cannot doubt but that the Apostles and their immediate successors were wholly strangers to it, and that, consequently, none of the primitive bishops or priests ever said mass, as being all true Protestants in this as well as other articles of faith. Here then lies the stress of the difficulty, viz.,—How all the bishops and priests in the world, having been brought up, as we must suppose, in the principles of the Protestant religion, and, consequently, in a total ignorance both of the doctrine and use of the mass, should afterwards not only, unanimously agree to embrace this new scheme of religious worship, but even to regard it as the most sacred and solemn part of the public devotion of the Church. What! could all this be done without contradiction, noise, or trouble? Or, if there were contentions, schisms, and disputes, as it is morally impossible but there must have been, unless the whole thing be a fiction, could events of that importance escape the notice of all historians? Sacramental Confession has its peculiar difficulty; for it is not a mere speculative point, but of all practical duties the most repugnant to human nature; and I dare say no man would ever have submitted to it, who was not first convinced that he could not be saved without it. But what increases the difficulty, my Lord Bishop, of introducing the practice of it is, that no dignity, either in church or in state, ever exempted any member of the Church of Rome from the obligation of it. All bishops, kings, princes, nay, emperors and popes themselves, have an equal share in the burden with the very meanest of the laity. They must all fall prostrate at the feet of their confessors, discover their most hidden sins, submit them to their censure, and perform the penance enjoined them. Now if this was not the doctrine of the apostles,—if all the popes and bishops of the primitive church were brought up in the principles of the Reformation,—finally, if the obligation of auricular confession be a Popish error, and was consequently unknown to antiquity, then I cannot forbear here asking your Lordship this question,—which of the two is most surprising, the extravagance of those who first took a fancy to impose this heavy yoke both on themselves and others, or the weakness of those who submitted to it? For, that it was effectually submitted to is a plain matter of fact. But, since the very attempt of introducing a novelty (if it really were one) so burdensome and odious was no better than a mad and extravagant undertaking, can any one imagine it met not with very great opposition in the beginning, and put the whole church into disorder and into confusion? Is it not natural to suppose, that both the laity and clergy rose up in defence of the Christian liberty their forefathers had enjoyed, and acknowledged that, since all Christians before them had been saved without stooping to the yoke of confession, they saw no reason but they might be saved upon the same easy terms? and would not all the particulars (had they really happened) have been recorded in some history of note? Truly whoever, my Lord Bishop, believes the contrary, is capable of being gulled in every one respect. This therefore is an incontestable truth,—viz., that a change from Protestantism to Popery in the particulars I have mentioned could not be effected without the greatest opposition, nor, consequently, without occasioning troubles and schisms in the church. For further proof wherefore, let us suppose that a set of men should at present attempt to introduce the number of seven Sacraments, the Mass, Auricular Confession, or any noted branch of Popery into the Church of England, I appeal to the judgment of all men in their senses, whether those religious zealots would not meet with a very warm opposition from all the Bishops, and from the whole of the English Clergy. Can any sane man, therefore, for one moment imagine that the first supposed change from Protestantism to Popery could be effected with less difficulty, than the second from Popery to Protestantism? Impossible!

I am my Lord Bishop,

Your most obedient servant,

VERAX.

April 2nd 1838.

A Catholic Layman.

**CONVERSION OF GEORGE GUSTAVUS MONK, SON OF THE REV.
GEORGE MONK, OF AVON-VILLA, CORSTON NEAR BATH.**

On Whit Sunday, the solemn festival of Pentecost, an imposing ceremonial took place in the Catholic Church at Weymouth, on occasion of the public abjuration of Protestantism, profession of the Catholic faith, and first communion, of George Gustavus Monk, son of the Rev. George Monk of Avon Villa, author of 'Fall of Man and his Redemption,' 'Pious Cottage Sketches,' and 'A warning voice,' &c. &c., in presence of a crowded congregation of Catholics, and a number of Protestants. Immediately after the prayers before mass were recited, Mr. Monk came forward and knelt at the foot of the altar, while the Rev. Doctor Butler, the pastor of the congregation, addressed to him, in an impressive manner, the solemn exhortation prescribed in the Roman Ritual to be read at the reception of a convert. The usual prayers being recited, which are also appointed on such occasions, Mr. Monk, in a distinct and clear voice, read his abjuration of Protestantism, and made profession of the Catholic Faith in the words of the creed of Pope Pius IV. Having been thus solemnly received into the Church of Christ, and heard with the deepest possible attention the exhortation also prescribed in the Ritual to be read to a convert after reception into the Church, he retired to one of the front seats in the body of the church, whence he again approached towards the conclusion of mass, and devoutly received, for the first time, the most holy sacrament. There were present great numbers of members of the Church of England and other religious communions, who had come to witness the imposing ceremony, and to whom the Rev. Pastor delivered a long and appropriate discourse. The whole ceremonial was peculiarly striking, and produced a great sensation in the neighbourhood. We are happy to learn, that Doctor Butler is preparing for immediate publication, the reasons that induced Mr. Monk to take this important step, the conference that took place between him and his convert, and the discourse delivered on Mr. Monk's reception into the Church. Some short time ago, a respectable female was also thus publicly received into the true fold, and the reverend pastor has now five others under instruction.—*Cath. Mag.*, for June 1839.

BELGIUM.

It appears by the Belgian journals, that a great number of Protestants have of late publicly gloried in renouncing the doctrines of heresy, and associating themselves to the true church. Among these the conversion of Madame Amélie-Josephine-Louisa Regnier, brought up in the Evangelical religion, who made her abjuration at Prayon, between Leige and Verviers, has been the most conspicuous. This abjuration had been preceded by that of Mademoiselle Ferdinande Regnier; at present Madam Dumont, sister of the preceding, who was converted some time before at Olne.—*London Orthodox Journal*.

DOUAY.

The conversion of Mr. Thomas Amos to the Catholic religion, which took place last year at St. Edmund's College in this town, is still the subject of much congratulation among the truly pious, in consequence of his continued fervour and unaltered determination, should his health permit him, to dedicate his brilliant talents to the service of the Altar. Mr. Amos, observe

the French journals, is an English gentleman of great talent and acquirements, and a distinguished architect; he studied under Pugin the father, and is also an intimate friend of the son, whose conversion to the Catholic faith has made so much noise. Mr. Amos has it in his intention to embrace the ecclesiastical state, if his health permit him, unfortunately it is extremely delicate.—*Ibid.*

EUPEN.

The curates of the deanery of Eupen have addressed the following petition to the King of Prussia:—

‘In the sentiments of a profound submission, such as it becomes subjects of the best of sovereigns to entertain, we, the undersigned curates of the deanery of Eupen, take the liberty, in all respect, to approach the throne of your royal majesty, in order to lay at your feet the supplications of and the ardent desires which have been awakened in thousands of hearts, in consequence of the lamented events which have taken place in our archdiocese, and above all, of the avulsion from his flock of our very revered Archbishop, Clement Augustus.

‘We learned with the most poignant affliction, not unparticipated in by our parishioners, the forcible bearing away, executed ten months ago, on the person of our worthy archbishop, and with no less sorrow the accusations brought against him, which, at the same time, were rendered matter of public notoriety.

‘These events were calculated to produce so much the more consternation and inquietude in the minds of your Catholic subjects, as they were utterly at a loss to explain to themselves the possibility of a divergency between the justice, ever tempered with clemency, adhered to by your royal majesty, recognized upon all occasions, and a prelate generally esteemed for his exalted virtues, and his inflexible fidelity to the faith. It enters not into our views to complain to your royal majesty of the painful situation in which we find ourselves, ever since that period, and, above all, ever since, as a supervening calamity, the serious question of competency, in reference to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, has arisen amongst us: prayer—ardent, unceasing prayer to our common Father in Heaven, added to confidence in the acknowledged justice of our beloved monarch, have alone been able to sustain our courage, in conjunction with that of the faithful committed to our direction.

But inasmuch, according to public documents, the head of our church, to whose decision, as to whatever concerns dogmas, we are exclusively bound by the fundamental character of our faith, has resolved all doubts with reference to the ecclesiastical proceedings of our beloved Archbishop, Clement Augustus; and, inasmuch as, according to the public journals, already several bishops, living under the mild sceptre of your Majesty, have been able to obey without obstacle the voice of the Sovereign Pontiff; and incontestable proof of the justice and great clemency of your royal Majesty, which every well-thinking subject with gratitude acknowledges; we are emboldened to lay before the throne of your Majesty our very humble supplication, taking it for granted, as we do, since no other deduction can be reasonably formed, that accusations, solely of a *civil character*, are the causes which detain our Prelate in painful separation from us, in full confidence that your royal Majesty will graciously deign to order that upon this case also a definitive judgment be speedily given; and, should it appear that the innocence so ardently wished for of our beloved Prelate is fully substantiated, that he may be restored to his flock.

‘We are, with the most profound submission of your royal Majesty,
the most faithful subjects,

‘THE CURATES OF THE DEANERY OF EUPEN.’

Intelligence.

ROME.—Mr. David Sombre, grandson of the Princes Begum, who died on the 27th of January, 1836, was admitted to an audience of His Holiness on the 23d of December: Cardinal Mezzofante acted as interpreter on the occasion. Several services have, at the solicitation of the colonel, taken place on behalf of his grandmother. The first was celebrated on the 27th of January, at St. Peter's, by the Archbishop of Edessa, Secretary of the Propaganda: Dr. Wiseman pronounced the *éloge* of the princess. Mr. Sombre has distributed alms amongst the poor.

On the 28th of December, the Bishop of Algiers took his departure. He was received with every mark of kindness. The Propaganda presented to him a great number of choice books.

On Christmas Eve, the Holy Father intoned the vespers in the Vatican Basilica. Matins were chanted in the Sistine Chapel: these were followed by a solemn mass, celebrated by Cardinal Patrizi, at which His Holiness, the Sacred College, and the Prelature, attended. In the morning, His Holiness celebrated mass in the Patriarchal Church.

The Feast of the Epiphany was ushered in by discharges of cannon from the Castle of St. Angelo. The Holy Father, attired pontifically, and with the tiara, took his station on the throne, in the Sistine Chapel, when a solemn mass was celebrated by the Cardinal Falzacappa, Bishop of Albano.

The Octave of the Epiphany was celebrated in the Church of St. Sylvestre *in Capite*, in a particular manner. For the convenience of working people, mass was celebrated early in the morning, which was followed by the recitation of the rosary, and by an instruction by Father Rylo, Jesuit missionary. There were also low masses, in diverse rites, followed by a solemn mass, chanted by several ecclesiastical congregations. For the first five days, at two o'clock p. m., sermons were delivered in English by Dr. Wiseman, Messrs. Macgill, Hughes, Ryan, and Henrich; and during the last three, sermons in French.

The first vespers of the Feast of the Circumcision were chanted in the Sistine Chapel, at which the Holy Father attended: Cardinal Pacca gave the benediction. Cardinal Mazzofanti celebrated mass on the day of the feast, on which occasion Father Meli, Procurator-general of the regular Minor Clerks, delivered a discourse 'on the Mystery of the Trinity.'

During the winter, religious exercises were performed for the English Catholics almost every Sunday, in the Churches of Jesus and Mary, under the direction of Dr. Wiseman.

On the 6th of February, at day-break, repeated discharges of artillery from the Castle of St. Angelo announced the anniversary of the coronation of the Holy Father. His Holiness attended the Sistine Chapel, where mass was celebrated by Cardinal Brigole. After mass, His Holiness received, in the adjoining hall, the felicitations of the Sacred College, through Cardinal Pacca. The lighting of the cupola, façade, and the colonnade of St. Peter's, was deferred till the following night, on account of the rain.

On the 9th of February, the Cardinals created by Leo XII. attended, in the choir of the Vatican Basilica, the annual service celebrated for the repose of his soul. The Patriarch of Constantinople officiated: His Holiness was present. On Ash-Wednesday the Holy Father blest and distributed the ashes in the Chapel of the Vatican: he afterwards attended mass, which was celebrated by Cardinal Gregorio, Grand Penitentiary.

M. De Jacobis, Lazarist, nominated as Prefect Apostolic of the Mission about to be opened in Abyssinia, is now at Rome, whence he is speedily to take his departure for his Mission, taking along with him a number of priests of the congregation of St. Lazarus.

A secret consistory was held at the Vatican on the 18th of February, in which His Holiness declared two Cardinal Priests, viz. John Soglia, Patriarch of Constantinople, Secretary to the congregation of Bishops and Regulars, and Anthony Tosti, Treasurer-General of the Chamber. These two were created and served *in pectore* in the consistory of the 12th of February, 1838. In the afternoon, the new cardinals were presented to His Holiness in the apartments of Cardinal Lambruschini. His Holiness has appointed Fabius-Maria Asquini, Archbishop of Tarsus, and present Nuncio at Naples, Secretary to the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars.

The King of Sardinia has permitted M. Flaget, Bishop of Bardstown, to make collections in his dominions for the propagation of the Faith. This prelate has preached several times in Turin.

The work of the propagation of the Faith is making especial progress amongst the poor classes of Turin.—*Catholic Magazine May, 1839.*

FLOWERS FROM THE HOLY FATHERS,

No. XII.

‘Deus ubique semper præsens est, sed præsentior est diligentibus, negligentibus abest.’—*Sti. Ambrosii. Lib. 9, in Cap. 10. Lucar.*

OUR God is present every where,
In land and sea, in earth and air;
Should you on eagles pinions wend
Your flight to earth's remotest end—
Scale heaven's vault, or fathom hell,
There does his infinite being dwell:
Shall darkness hide thee from his sight?
To him thick darkness brings not night!

Yet to the humble, those who keep
Their hearts in love, who mourn and weep,
His holy presence comes more full,
To guard, to guide, to watch, to rule,
The lowly soul more intimate,
Receives his dew and owns it great.
And as it looks, around, above,
New increase drinks of grace and love.

But ah! to those who turn away,
Apart from God, to rest on clay,
God too shall turn away and leave
Them empty, 'till they wake to grieve,
Too late their loss,—too late to mourn—
Too late to dream of a return—
Too late to clasp the Blessed Cross,
For theirs are then the pains of loss!

Oh by the love that Jesus bore—
Here let us turn—here weep—deplere—
Here let God's holy presence come,
Here in thy heart prepare a home,
Here by confession's searching light,
With glowing love and heart contrite,
Receive thy God within thy breast,
Where, watchful ever, he may rest.

*Printed by Messrs. W. Rushton and Co., Calcutta, for the Proprietors
price one rupee per month, or ten rupees per annum in advance. To non-
subscribers 8 annas per number.*

THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

'One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.'

NO. XIX.

NOVEMBER 9, 1839.

VOL. I.

Among the various pretexts by which the reformers endeavoured to justify their separation from the Church, and spoliation of her property, her alleged corruptions and the profligacy of the Clergy are most usually brought forward. This excuse is not a new one ; it is as ancient as heresy itself ; and is frequently animadverted on by the early Fathers. A reference to the annals of the Church and to the history of heresy at every period will clearly show, that the alleged corruptions, and abuses in the Church, have always formed the main apology for rebellion against her authority. St. Cyprian justly remarks, that invective against the pretended disorders of the Pastors of the Church, is the surest of all methods (since it produces discontent) of producing disunion ; and the infallible means at the same time, of rendering the declaimer popular, because it gives to his intemperance the semblance of the love of piety, and conceals his guilt under a mask of zeal.

Catholics, however, do not deny that at the time of the Reformation, so called, and long before, abuses did exist in the Church, and irregularities among the Clergy. But what of that ? Our Lord when he founded his Church, never intimated that her Pastors should be all saints, and her members all holy, that her peace and harmony should never be disturbed by passion, vice, and human weakness. He has on the contrary distinctly foretold us, that though ' many are called, yet few are chosen.' Exemption from abuse was never deemed a necessary mark of the true Church. The authority vested in the chair of Moses was not vacated or rendered void by the personal vices of some who sat in it ; so neither is that of St. Peter's ; nor is the Apostolical commission of the Pastors of the Church in general annulled, or in any degree diminished by the personal vices or weaknesses of individuals. Sanctity has not been secured or promised to this or that individual, but to the Church, in which, along with the bad, there has always existed a multitude of individuals eminent for their sanctity. For, notwithstanding the prevalence of vice, Sanctity is, and for ever must be, the characteristic of the Christian Church,—a feature by which, amid all the scenes of iniquity and the confusion of error, she may always be distinguished from every false and spurious institution.

N N

But, while it is admitted that great abuses and disorders did exist in the Church at the time of the Reformation, we maintain that the accounts which the Reformers themselves, and Protestant writers in general, have given and yet daily give of these disorders, are most grossly and extravagantly exaggerated, and for the most part entirely false. They were generally the inventions of the first Reformers, in order more easily to effect their premeditated revolution; and to screen the peril of their own Apostacy; and to have a pretext for seizing upon the revenues of the Church. They are the accusations of revolutionists and plunderers: for, says Melancton, in one of his Epistles, '*It is not for the sake of the Gospel that our Reformers contend; but for their own temporal interests.*' Surely, then, the testimonies of such men should be received with caution; for, as Burke observes, 'Enemies and thieves are bad witnesses.' It is true that the same imputations, though still kept up, are not now continued from the same motives; but from a spirit of ill will reposing on prejudice; and from prejudice reposing chiefly upon ignorance. '*When we write upon this subject,*' says Mr. Shuttleworth, '*we dip our pens in gall: every allusion is burdened with acrimony; and satire never wearies in launching her arrows in the same direction.*' From writers such as these, it is vain to look for truth.

The accusations, therefore, respecting the disorders and abuses of the Church, even at the time of the Reformation, when the general depravity is supposed to have reached to its utmost acme, are grossly exaggerated. In proof of this, I might appeal to the testimony of history; or to the accounts which have been furnished to us by a multitude of writers of unimpeachable veracity. Such, for example, as Erasmus, who surely was no flatterer of the Catholics; and who, from his situation and knowledge, was peculiarly competent to judge of the state of things, assures us, repeatedly, that the condition of the Church, at the above period, so far from being such as its enemies have represented it, was, on the contrary, *even then*, distinguished by the piety, the holiness, the learning, &c. of immense portions of its members;—in so much that he adds: '*If Paul himself had come down from Heaven to view it, it would not have displeased him.*'

However, it shall not be to the testimonies of Catholic writers,—because the Protestants will suspect these of partiality,—that we shall appeal. It shall be to the acknowledgments of the protestants themselves; of the very men (for nothing could be more incoherent than they are) who, most grossly insulting the Church, have made her alleged corruptions the pretended motive of their separation from her communion. It is, therefore, a fact that the first Reformers themselves, Luther, Beza, Melancton, Zuinglius, and others in various parts of their works, forgetting, it would seem, their previous accusations, very honestly admit, that there prevailed in the Church, at the very time when they were rebelling against her; and this too among a large portions of her members, a spirit of piety and innocence of life, a system of mortification, &c., which did credit to the Christian cause. Nay they allow, that even in the convents themselves, the most insulted of all the Catholic Institutions; and in which, if we are to believe the generality of English writers, there prevailed the most unbounded licentiousness, they allow, that there existed the practice and cultivation of very distinguished holiness. '*In convents,*' says Luther, '*no intrusion of worldly cares was permitted; and life was devoted wholly to the service of God.*'

And hence the great Reformer tells us, speaking of his own conduct : '*I practised, while I was a monk, all the virtues of the religious state.*'

The truth on this subject has occasionally escaped from the most decided enemies of Catholicity. Thus for instance, Bishop Porteus, who was certainly any thing but a friend to Popery, describes in the following manner, the character and conduct of its Pastors, during those ages, when corruption is supposed to have been most predominant : 'They proved,' says he, 'a check to the despotism of our monarchs; and kept the community from falling to pieces by the factions of the nobles. It ought never to be forgotten, that, for what we call our *Magna Charta*, that main foundation of our free constitution, we are principally indebted to the eloquence, the spirit, and the activity of an English primate, assisted by almost the whole body of his Clergy. It is true indeed, that in other respects, the conduct of our Clergy was not always so irreproachable as might have been wished : for, they must needs partake in some degree of the corruption and barbarity which then generally prevailed. Yet, great numbers of them did, notwithstanding, preserve themselves pure and undefiled from the vices of the age, and were exemplary in their manners, temperate, charitable, meek, and heavenly-minded. Their cloisters were a retreat, not merely, *as it is commonly supposed* for the idle, and the dissolute, but for the studious, the afflicted, the penitent, and devout. They afforded support to all the neighbouring poor; and in those days of lawless violence, were extremely useful, as places of refuge and security, for the defenceless and the weak.' Such are the features of the ancient Church, as delineated by a man, from whom nothing but the plainest evidence could possibly have extorted any testimonial in its praise.

Speaking of our clergy in general, Mr. Shuttleworth, whose aversion to Popery was quite as great as that of the Bishop, says of them, 'If the Romish Clergy were eager in the acquisition of wealth, it was not to allow it to accumulate in useless ingots, but to promote the glory of God, by establishments of a benevolent nature, by extensive alms to the poor, and hospitality to the stranger, the pilgrim, and the unfortunate; and also by architectural monuments of the most splendid description.' Speaking of this state of our monasteries, he remarks : 'It is easier far to condemn than to reflect and investigate. And those who are only acquainted with monasteries as they meet with them in fiction and romance; who look upon the mouldered cloister, and the vaulted cell, as the elysiums of vice, or the dark theatres of cruelty, are as unjust as they are uninformed. All history shows that within the walls of a convent, there was invariably to be found a balm for every sorrow; consolation for the broken heart, and hope for the wounded spirit.' Adducing proofs of the spirit, which animated the episcopacy, he cites the examples (and from these we may judge of the conduct of the whole order) of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York. Of the former, he says, 'from the age of Augustine, few can be named, who, besides being conspicuous for talents, knowledge, and virtue, are not likewise deserving of honour for munificence, benevolence, and charity!'—Of the latter: From the year 625, eighty-three Archbishops have occupied the Metropolitan throne: and for patriotism, loyalty, learning, benevolence, eloquence, true Christian piety, and virtuous principles, stand pre-eminent in all existing records.' Such as these are the testimonials in relation to the PARENT CHURCH which truth has wrung from the hostility of her declared enemies. If the public

do not entertain the same equitable notions, it is because they are ignorant; and instead of consulting sources of correct information, consult only those which are calculated to deceive them. Even Hume himself, speaking of the accounts, which, at the time of the Reformation, were constantly given by the Protestants, respecting the state of the Church, its convents, &c. observes that little or no credit ought to be affixed to them. 'In times of faction,' says he, 'no equity can be expected of adversaries. And as it was known, that the King's intention, in the visitation of monasteries, was to find a pretence for abolishing them, we naturally conclude, that the reports of the Commissioners are very little to be relied on. Friars were encouraged to bring information against their brethren. The slightest evidence was credited. And even the calumnies spread abroad by the friends of the Reformation were regarded as grounds of proof.' Burnett, too, with all his hatred of every thing Catholic, makes the same observations. 'Generally,' he says, 'it was cried out, that underhand and ill practices were used (by the visitors of the monasteries). Therefore to quiet these reports, and to justify what they were about, all the foul stories that could be found out, were published to defame these houses.' In fact our Protestant brethren should always bear in mind that the Reformation was a *Revolution*, and 'a Revolution,' as justly observed by a Protestant writer, 'in which destruction, much more than Reformation, was the object.' For which reason, violence and injustice were of course essential to its success.

A CLEAR EXPOSITION OF THE FOUR CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TRUE CHURCH.

(Concluded from our last.)

Our Church is APOSTOLICAL. Such a change of doctrine, as we alluded to in our last, cannot be objected by our adversaries against our Church.

If she has not received all her articles of faith from Christ and the Apostles, let our Protestant brethren point out the first inventor of any of her dogmas; let them show us the year, the place, and the cause of such an invention; let them cite any author of ancient times that either taught, or refuted any point as a new invention. They style us *Papists*; but who was the first Pope that instructed us in what we were to believe, if not St. Peter? And have not all his successors continued to teach the doctrines inculcated by him? We could easily draw out after Augustine and Optatus of Milevi a catalogue of them all, and prove that the succession is uninterrupted and legitimate from Peter to Gregory XVI., the reigning Pontiff. But what a different picture is presented by the temporal government of Rome! What a contrast between the succession of the temporal, and that of the spiritual rulers of that Capital! It was at one time commanded by idolaters, at another by Arians, then by Monothelites, at another by Iconoclasts. It was at one time besieged, at another sacked, at another assaulted by the violence of the soldiery, the despotism of Princes, the corruption of perverse Ecclesiastics. On the contrary, its Pontiffs at one time lived in catacombs, at another were banished to desert islands, at a third were cast into prison, at a fourth were compelled to save themselves by flight from malignant persecution. But all, notwithstanding these destructive revolutions, were the legitimate suc-

cessors of those that preceded them. Nay more. The very ancient churches united with Rome, but nevertheless distinct dioceses, if there were drawn out a tree of succession of their Bishops, all would be found to have been derived from some Apostle.

Add to this the continued succession of miracles from the Apostolic ages to our own times. Miracles we speak of, the most evident and the most indubitable. We are aware that Calvin boldly asserts that those prodigies were forgeries, or works of diabolical necromancy. But rashly. He may denounce as a forgery the miracle, that Mahomet pretended to have wrought in the Moon, by splitting, and then reuniting it; because his own followers avow that, when working it, he was unwilling to be witnessed by any body. He may denounce as a forgery the Ghost that Zuinglius calls the '*Resource of the Eucharist*,' but could not distinguish whether it was black or white. He may denounce the vision of certain Lutherans, spoken of in the *Dream of Luther*, in which they saw and heard the lamentations of their deceased Master, deploring the abandonment of his disciples. He may denounce many other visions, stamped with no character of truth. But surely he cannot, without incurring the imputation of temerity, reject prodigies wrought in so great number, and at the sight of innumerable persons, related by such a variety of authors, who were often present at the event, and are all of unquestionable veracity, as the infidel Voltaire acknowledged with reference to Butler's Lives of Saints.—Add to this the extraordinary strictness practised by the Holy See in the investigation of miracles. It is carried so far, that there is an officer of the Papal Government expressly appointed to make all possible objections, and turn up all manner of difficulties in order to oppose the verification of any miracle; or, if true, to evince its conformity with the laws of Nature. Hence he is styled '*L'Avvocato del Diavolo*;' or, the '*Devil's lawyer*.' We recollect a striking instance of this excessive strictness. A Protestant of respectability, during his sojourn in the '*Eternal City*,' became very intimate with one of its Prelates.—The latter, on one occasion, handed him for perusal the Acts of the canonization of a certain saint: he read them attentively, and with the utmost surprise and satisfaction assured the Divine, that if all our miracles were as well proved as those he had read, he would believe them all. Hereupon the Prelate, to his great dismay, replied, that notwithstanding the extraordinary scrutiny he had admired, those prodigies had been rejected!! The reader may easily imagine the astonishment of the gentleman.

Quæ cum ita sint, we repeat that the well-authenticated miracles of the Catholic Church cannot, without the highest temerity, be reproved. But even allowing them all to be unfounded, well may we say after St. Austin, that it is the greatest of all miracles that a religion so opposed to human licentiousness, and to the indulgence of every passion, a religion which has undergone greater persecutions than had ever been witnessed prior to its establishment, should have been embraced by the majority of Christians, and preserved inviolate until the present day. Hence we may justly boast, that *we alone* are warranted in repeating that article of belief, which at the commencement of this exposition we alluded to, viz. '*I believe in One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church:*' ONE, because *our Church alone* possesses *unity* of faith among all her members: HOLY, because *she alone* has produced men of unquestionable *sanctity*: CATHOLIC, because *she alone* has existed in every age,

and is the same in every nation ; APOSTOLIC, because *she alone* can trace her origin to the Apostles, and her Supreme Pastor is the *only Bishop in the world*, who is a direct and legitimate successor of any of the Apostles*.

THE ADVOCATE'S ANTI-POPERY CHAMPIONS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—As you do not seem inclined to adopt my suggestion to treat your readers now and then with some of the beauties of the *Advocate's* No-popery-eloquence, I take the liberty of sending you a few remarks on the last number, which fully sustains the high reputation for candour, justice, and veracity which that *Christian Journal* has so justly acquired. The downfall of 'popery' (you see, Mr. Editor, how readily I fall in with the *Advocate's* humour in calling names!) must surely be nigh at hand, since three such doughty champions as FABER, SIGMA, and ELIA, at once appear in arms against it, firmly resolved on its total destruction, stock and root, bark and branch. In short, the days of the Scarlet Lady are now numbered by the *Christian Advocate*.

I find, however, that I was mistaken in imputing the false quotation from St. Ireneus, noticed in my last, to the *Advocate*: he has only followed that Arch-forger, the Revd. G. S. Faber; some of whose fabrications I shall notice in order that your readers may be enabled to appreciate their general value. His work, entitled '*Difficulties of Romanism*,' has been refuted over and over again, particularly by Bishop Trevern, in his '*Amicable discussion*'—the Revd. G. Carless in his unanswered and unanswerable work, entitled '*The Catholic Doctrine of Transubstantiation proved from the early Fathers, in answer to the Revd. G. S. Faber*'—and the Revd. F.C. Husenbeth. Faber, although utterly unable to refute the proofs, or grapple with the arguments of his powerful opponents, nevertheless goes on doggedly repeating his own falsifications as boldly and unblushingly as if nothing had been written in their refutation. 'I have no words,' says Mr. Husenbeth, 'to express adequately what Mr. Faber merits, by the effrontery of bringing forward again what, having once been refuted, should on every principle of honor, be forever abandoned. The reader will see that this is the Rector's habitual practice; if he is overturned a thousand times, up he comes again, like the doughty hero of a show box: or, like those men of pitch, with lead in their feet, which however fairly levelled, are sure to roll up again, not by their native weight, but by the help of acquired lead, or brass as it may be.'

Mr. Faber asserts, that '*Bishop Trevern confesses, that Jesus Christ has not revealed to us the knowledge of Purgatory*.' Now let us hear what the Bishop really does say on the subject. After stating that some sins often remain to be expiated in the other world, he asks: But where? In what place, and in what manner, had it been necessary for us to be instructed in these questions? Jesus Christ would doubtless have revealed the knowledge of them. He has not done it: therefore, we can only form

* Hence if legitimate succession be requisite, as it undoubtedly is, to render a Church Apostolical, the Anglican Church is destitute of that qualification, as its Bishops are neither successors of any Apostle, nor united with him, who is the only successor of any of them.

conjectures more or less probable. I shall not trouble you with a detail of them, having only undertaken to elucidate dogmas, and not human opinions. Of whatever kind it may be, the place of these painful and temporary expiations has been appropriately called *purgatory* by the councils of Florence and Trent : and whatever may be the kind of torments with which souls are there afflicted, we know, and it ought to satisfy us to know, that they are in a state of suffering, unhappy, and unable to help themselves.' —Here it is quite evident that the Bishop is speaking not of the existence of purgatory, but of its locality, and kind of suffering. If any possible doubt could exist that such was his meaning, the following note, which he added to the above passage, would completely remove it :—' Were I to ask you the situation of *Limbo*, the place which contained the souls of the just departed before Jesus Christ, you would have nothing but conjectures to give me in reply. You admit the existence of *Limbo*, because its existence is proved to you, although its local position remains unknown ? Let it equally suffice for us to be assured of the existence of purgatory, without troubling ourselves about its locality, without enquiring how souls can be confined in a place, since they were so in what we call *Limbo*, or Abraham's bosom.'—' By purgatory,' says the venerable A. Butler, 'no more is meant by Catholics than a middle state of souls ; viz. of purgation from sin by temporary chastisement, or a punishment of some sin inflicted after death, which is not eternal. As to the place, manner, or kind of these sufferings, nothing has been defined by the Church ; and all who, with Dr. Deacon, except against this doctrine, on account of the circumstance of a material fire, quarrel about a mere scholastic question, in which a person is at liberty to choose either side,' Dr. Trevern proves that the Catholic doctrine of purgatory—by whatever name it may be called—though confirmed by it, is more ancient than Christianity—was approved by our Saviour, and has come down to us from his Apostles. Can any one, after reading the above, entertain a moment's doubt that Mr. Faber has been guilty of gross and wilful deception ?

Mr. Faber asserts also, ' That that a modern Romish Doctor, Mr. Husenbeth has been driven to confess : that, although the latin Clergy OUGHT to be able to trace every point of what he calls Catholic Faith, up to the Apostles, they, in truth, CANNOT trace their peculiarities up to the Apostles, thro' the testimony of the Fathers of the first three centuries.' This is one of Faber's facts : Mr. Husenbeth *has made no such confession*. However, let us hear himself on the subject : ' Mr. Faber,' says he, ' proceeds to assert that what he terms our peculiarities come dropping in, some earlier and some later, but all invariably too late to be proved apostolical. He will have no witnesses produced later than the first Council of Nice in 325. — But while I deny the Rector's right to refuse testimony later than the first Council of Nice, *do I admit that our doctrines cannot be proved apostolical from the very witnesses which Mr. Faber has chosen ? Let him not imagine that I make any such concession*—Let me assure him that none would be more ready than ourselves to declaim against the doctrines which he denounces as the inventions and corruptions of men, if we had not every argument of their apostolicity. It is our glory that *we can prove them all to have been taught by primitive antiquity* : it is this very circumstance that makes us cling to them with the tenacity of lively faith.' Mr. Faber goes on, ' How,' he exclaims, ' persons who make such acknowledgments, can still have adhered

to the commission of the Church of Rome, I pretend not to comprehend, and therefore cannot explain; suffice it to say, that the acknowledgments *have* been made, &c.' Could the genius of impudence itself exceed this? Such then are the weapons with which 'popery' is to be overthrown!!!

I pass over SIGMA's lucubrations touching the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and his alleged corruptions in a French translation of the Testament, because they concern the Catholics of Bengal no more than the French Revolution, and I come at once to his high flown eulogium on the English authorized version of the Scriptures. On this point however, as indeed on every other, abusing 'popery' always excepted, Protestant doctors are not agreed.

'Our English Bibles,' says D'Israeli, 'were suffered to be so corrupted, that no books ever swarmed with such innumerable errata. These errata unquestionably were, in a great part, voluntary omissions, interpolated passages, and meanings reformed and forged for certain purposes.'

The monthly London Review for February, 1833, observes on a pamphlet of Thomas Curtis, of Grove House, Islington. 'In this comparatively brief pamphlet we find the exposition of one of the most singular deceptions to which the world has yet been exposed. The imposition is nothing short of a downright falsification of the Scripture. Need we add a syllable more to rouse the attention of the thinking community.'

In the same Review we find, 'that in April, 1832, a memorial was addressed on this subject to the Vice-Chancellors of the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, and the other delegates of the Clarendon Press.' It was signed by the following gentlemen:—J. Bennet, D.D.; J. Blackburn; George Collison; F. A. Cox, LL.D.; Thomas Curtis; J. Fletcher, D.D.; E. Henderson; J. P. Smith, D.D.; J. Townley, D.D.; R. Winter, D.D.

This memorial states, 'That the modern Bibles issued from the Press of the University of Oxford, abounded with deviations from the authorized version of King James I. That though some of these errors were merely typographical, yet of those that were intentional, the number was of a serious amount. That in the book of Genesis, there were upwards of eight hundred errors; in the Psalms, six hundred; in the Gospel of Matthew four hundred and sixteen; and in about the fourth part of the Bible, an aggregate of two thousand nine hundred and thirty one.' *Yet this book, with all its corruptions, is the sole rule of Protestant Faith!*

This letter having already run to too great a length I cannot for the present take due notice of ELIA's polite and logical effusion:—I may however, observe that it abounds with such flowers of rhetoric; as, 'Popery is the deepest conception, and mightiest achievement of Satan.' 'Papal Rome is Satan's work, constructed with the materials of God, revealed in his Holy Word.' We are accustomed to have Creeds made for us; but ELIA is so good as to make Saints and miracles for us also. In vain have I searched the Church Calendar for St. Juniper; nor do I find any allusion in the lives of Sts. Francis and Ignatius to the miracles mentioned by ELIA. I find indeed mention made of the seven Martyrs of Ephesus; but with this trifling difference, viz. that their *relies* were discovered when the cavern was opened, whereas ELIA tells us that *they were permitted to awake*. ELIA had better include the renowned exploits of Jack-the-giant-killer, among his Catholic miracles.

A LAYMAN.

Selections.

MR. LUCAS'S REASONS FOR BECOMING A ROMAN CATHOLIC.

Reasons for Becoming a Roman Catholic, addressed to the Society of Friends.
By FREDERICK LUCAS, ESQ. of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law. London; BOOKER and DOLMAN, and T. JONES, 1839.

THE history of Christianity in the British Islands is one of the most interesting in the records of any nation. Its synonyme, the Catholic religion, is well known to have been introduced into Britain under the Pontificate of Eleutherius, in the second century, whence it was expelled by the Saxons in the fifth, and, with its professors, found an asylum amongst the mountains of Wales. To rescue again so fair a portion of the church of Christ from the grasp of Paganism, must ever have been the desire of his Vicars, who, during the fourth and fifth centuries, filled the chair of St. Peter; but its accomplishment was reserved for the great St. Gregory, who, in the person of Augustine the monk, brought the Anglo-Saxons into the fold of the Church. For nine hundred years, the Church of Britain, fruitful in saints and in every good work, kept united in faith with its parent, until betrayed by those whom it had nurtured, it was delivered up to the caprice of a lewd tyrant, who, to gratify a base passion, severed the bond of Christian unity, and led the way to that fatal separation, first planned by Cranmer, and afterwards completed by Elizabeth.

That the great bulk of the people of England was opposed to any change in the national religion is an undoubted fact; Englishmen are never ready hastily to embrace new theories, and least of all could they be expected to adopt *foreign* opinions in opposition to the dogmas of a Church, under which their country had, for nine hundred years, risen to pre-eminence and power among the nations. But, unfortunately, popular opinion had little influence in England in the sixteenth century, and thus a few rapacious nobles and venal clergymen were enabled to force a new religion upon the people of England, contrary to the wishes and feelings of the nation.

If the same means of information had existed then as now, if the press had been free, and if the numerous facilities now in use for giving vent to public opinion, had been afforded our Catholic countrymen, most assuredly, the Reformation so called, never would have obtained a footing in England.

It was successful only in those countries where the people were sunk in ignorance of apathy; but it made little or no progress amongst the more civilized nations of Europe. It is admitted even by Hume (Hist. vol. v. chap. xxix), that the Reformation 'owed not its success to reason and reflection.' Under the specious pretext of religious freedom, the aim of the Reformers was to erect a religious despotism on the ruins of the Catholic Church, as all their acts testify. The following extracts from an Article in the 53rd No. of the Edinburgh Review, on the Toleration of the Reformers, will place this matter in its true light.

'Protestant writers in general are apt to describe the Reformation as a struggle for religious freedom... Now, we humbly apprehend that the free exercise of private judgment was most heartily abhorred by the first Reformers; *except only where the persons who assumed it had the good fortune to be exactly of their opinion.* It is obvious also that the freedom for which our first Reformers so strenuously contended, did not, by any means, include a freedom to think as the Catholics thought; that is to say, to think as Europe had thought for many ages, and as the greatest part of Europe thought at that very time, and continues to think to this very day. *The complete extirpation of the Catholic Church, not merely as a public establishment, but as a tolerated sect, was the avowed object of our first Reformers.*'

These facts are so notorious, so interwoven with the frame and texture of our own legislation, for the last three hundred years, that we are utterly amazed at the hardihood of those writers who still extol the Reformation as 'a struggle for religious freedom.'

We shall of course be told, that as the Reformation only prevailed over ignorance, it must now retrograde in those countries in which it obtained a footing, from the progress of modern enlightenment. And so in fact it has. The shallow sophistry of private judgment, in opposition to legitimate Church authority, has led to a wide spread of infidelity, which, on the other hand, has served as a beacon to warn many persons of acute minds, of the dangers they run by adhering to a system which leads to such an unfortunate result. In Germany, we behold men of masterminds, who were nurtured in Protestantism, taking refuge in the haven of the Catholic Church, to escape being ingulphed in the vortex of rationalism; and, if in this country the number of eminent converts to our holy faith is yet comparatively few, it is because our men of literature and science have been, hitherto, more intent upon the prosecution of their favorite pursuits than the concerns of religion; for it cannot be disguised that in this country, the vast majority of *literati* and scientific men are Deists, or at least merely nominal Christians. Nor can the case be otherwise, and for this reason, that the logic of Protestantism leads to uncertainty, and uncertainty to unbelief. But if by any means, these men could be prevailed upon to study religion in its source—to look upon it as an inspired system—to consider the church a divine institution, governed by rulers duly commissioned and authorized, to whom, as a body, was given a promise of indefectibility,—then, indeed, we might soon expect as great a reaction amongst this class in favour of the ancient faith, as has taken place in protestant Germany. We are not without hopes that ere long the list of our converts will be adorned with some splendid names from the ranks of our opponents; and, were we permitted, we could mention several late converts, who would do honour to any class of religionists.

Amongst the most recent *known* conversions is that of Mr. Lucas, formerly a member of that respectable body, the Society of Friends, who, in a christian and manly spirit, has come forward and stated to his *quondam* religious associates, his 'Reasons for becoming a Roman Catholic.' We had heard favourably of Mr. Lucas's talents as a lecturer on education, and of the high reputation he enjoyed amongst the 'Friends;' and knowing the close approximation in some points (the rule of faith in particular), which exists between Catholic principles and those of the 'Friends,' as laid down by Robert Barclay, their celebrated Apologist, we anticipated, when announced, a work from Mr. Lucas's pen of no ordinary interest. In this expectation we have not been disappointed. Indeed, we do not hesitate to say that the pamphlet in question is one of the ablest controversial treatises which has appeared for several years. We do not know how long Mr. Lucas may have occupied himself, before his conversion, in the study of Catholic theology, but his performance is evidently the result of deep reflection; and evinces a grasp of mind which places him in the first class of dialecticians. But it is full time that we should direct the attention of our readers, to some of the more prominent parts of the 'Reasons,' and in doing so, we shall begin with the beginning, which perhaps is the most interesting part of the work.

It seems to me that a person who separates from the religious society in which he has been born and educated, for the purpose of joining another, which is little known to those whom he is leaving, and which, although little known, is yet much disliked, and bitterly condemned, owes it both to them and to himself to furnish some explanation of the reasons by which he has been guided. All change of religion implies a disapprobation—qualified or unqualified—of one body, and approbation of another. And in the present case, where the Catholics are regarded with so much unfounded jealousy and blind fear by the Society of Friends, it cannot but amount almost to a duty to shew those I am leaving, that I am leaving them with the fullest sympathy, and that the Church which I have joined is deserving of far other feelings than those with which it has been hitherto regarded.

'In truth, on this most important of subjects, the mass of Protestants live and breathe in an atmosphere of delusion. They have not the faintest conception of the truth. I say this with the more confidence, because if the Catholic Church were such as I (in common with those I am addressing) formerly conceived her to be, I should not now be in communion with her. But it is not so. She is not such as she has been represented. She is indeed a holy and venerable mother of the faithful, even of those who do not acknowledge her authority, filled with all soundness of doctrine, and all wholesome discipline, and if

in days past I contributed in any manner, through ignorance to spread and strengthen the contempt and hostility with which she has been too long regarded, I accept with joy, as a fitting retribution, that share of ridicule with which this announcement is sure to be at first encountered. It is, then, only on a first view, and where great ignorance prevails, that the popular notion of the contrast between Catholicism and Quakerism can be honestly entertained. A contrast indeed there is, sufficiently deep and broad, but it is wholly different from the ordinary conception: and it is not of a nature to prevent me from looking back with gratitude to the Giver of all Good, that among so many warring and jarring sects he predestinated me to be born and educated in that one of them which I believe to be the most spiritual of all.'—p. 3-4.

Mr. Lucas, with an excusable lingering predilection, states that the first establishment of Quakerism was a noble effort in most unpropitious times. A few humble-minded men, conscious of a spiritual guidance, far transcending all human reason and sagacity, felt that truth was not to be obtained amid the war of words, of pride, and of human reason, and that fierce and mutual hatred which raged among the various sects of Protestants. They saw the absurdity of attempting 'to measure the ideas of the Divine mind by those of the human reason;' they saw the monstrous absurdity of subjecting the revelations of God to the petty criticisms of man's understanding; they saw in this matter of religion there could be but two parts,—God, the teacher, teaching with authority,—man, the taught, receiving and learning with submission; they had little sympathy for the 'right of private judgement;' they dreaded nothing more than being confounded with the herds of Christians, the swarms of sects around them; they knew the shallowness of Protestantism; they abhorred all that vain talk, 'I am of Paul, I of Apollos, I of Cephas, and I of Christ; they asked the Sectarians about them, 'Is Christ divided?' And seeing that the right of private judgment led to division, to discord, to want of faith, to the exalting of the natural man over the spiritual; they sought for, and proclaimed that they had discovered, the true rule, which would lead men into unity, agreement, and faith. Such were the views of George Fox and his disciples; but as Mr. Lucas observes, the experience of two centuries has shewn the fallacy of their glowing anticipations, that these were destined to achieve a like glorious victory with the christianity of the Apostles. The attempt, however, springing as it did out of the very hot-bed of Protestantism, is considered by Mr. Lucas as 'not the less a noble and surprising effort.'

'Laying their foundation thus deep, or rather, ascending through an abasement of the natural reason of man to this lofty eminence,—it is not surprising that they evolved much that was admirable. In the general dissolution and tearing to pieces of the entireness of Catholic verity, which accompanied the enthronement of error at the time of the Reformation, each sect seized hold of, and appropriated to itself, that portion of truth which the half blindness of its members enabled them to discern. Milton,—whose piercing vision and almost prophetic insight could not prevail against the untamed haughtiness and unsettled humour which led him all his life to wander from opinion to opinion, till it has become doubtful whether he died affirming or denying the Divinity of our Blessed Saviour,—Milton well understood this fragmentary condition of Protestantism, where he described how the virgin truth that once 'was a perfect shape, most glorious to look upon,' had 'her lovely form hewed into a thousand pieces, and scattered to the four winds. From that time,' he continues, 'ever since, the sad friends of truth, such as durst appear, imitating the careful search that Isis made for the mangled body of Ostris, went up and down, gathering up limb by limb, still as they could find them. *We have not yet found them all, nor ever shall do, till her master's second coming.*'* Truly a sorrowful destiny, as you will agree with me, this ever seeking, never to find! But amidst this rambling and unguided search for the fragments of true religion, as no Protestant sect, perhaps not even the Unitarian, has lost the whole truth, so but a portion of it has fallen to the lot of each.'—pp. 4-6.

Some of these sects, like the Anglican Church, as Mr. Lucas observes, have retained, in greater or less perfection, the outward forms and organization, while the spirit which breathed life into them, has utterly fled.

'And as men in the wild and desolate places of the earth, discover some gigantic bone or skeleton, which tells them that here in old times was an organized body, full of life, and health, and vigour, so in poring over the solemn liturgies and devout services of the Anglican Protestants, you are in every part reminded of some doctrine of the Church, there lifeless and marrowless, which they have retained in name and in skeleton, while they have abjured it in reality and practice; so that those who in the present day, are

striving to infuse a new life into what has hitherto lain dead and profitless, are found by common consent to differ only by imperceptible shades from the hated and dreaded Papists.—p. 6.

The following contrast between the Anglican system and the Catholic worship is beautifully put.

‘The Anglican system, worldly in its origin, is naturally wanting in divine nature, in real spiritual life. Its forms, its ceremonies, its ordinances, are *formal*, repressive of the free development of spiritual growth. They are all devoted and adapted to the production of this one result, outward decency and uniformity. The ordinances of the Catholic Church, on the other hand, originally sprung from, and are by their own nature nutritive of the highest spiritual life.

‘The Anglican service is a piece of human mechanism. It is like one of those rustic arbours formed of unplanned branches, which holds out some shew of vegetation, because its frame-work has been cut from a living tree, but it has no interior life; and you may take away any of its parts without injury to what remains. Yet for a while men sit and live, and are merry within it. But in a short time the under timbers become decayed, and the worm eats into the substance, and men come and repair a little here and a little there, and as it goes on consuming inwardly, they cover it every year with some deceitful varnish, that gives it a false appearance of youth and freshness. But at last it will hold no longer, and they sweep it away as unprofitable lumber, and gather the fragments together, and heap them up for burning.

‘The Catholic worship on the other hand, is a tree of Divine growth, which springs from a soil that the Divine blessing has made fertile; and it strikes its roots deep into the earth, and spreads its branches aloft into the sky; and it drops down its boughs on all sides of it, and they penetrate into new soil and take root, and again rise up and become themselves trees, and the parents of new vegetation; and in a little time the earth is beautified with a forest of trees, all deriving their principle of life from the parent, around which they bloom and flourish, and which is the Holy Mother of them all. And as trees have their period when the sap rises, when they put forth in succession leaves, and flowers, and fruit, and at last winter comes and strips them of all their outward honours, and they seem to the ignorant, who knows not of the coming spring, fit only for the axe of the woodman, and ready for burning; so is it with this divine tree. It, too, has its time when the sap rises, and circulates freely through all its branches, and bursts forth in every twig; and it, too, puts forth leaves, and flowers, and fruit; and it, too, has its winter, when it seems for a time dying or dead, to him that knows not the mystery of the revolving year; though even then, like the orange tree, it bears upon it fruit hastening to ripeness. And the unskilled man, greedy of destruction, calls aloud for the axe of the spoiler, and longs for the consummation that is never to take place. For the winter passes away, and the soft breath of spring touches its dry members, and the sap rises from the soil of divine fertility, and penetrates to every fibre, and it sends out new shoots, and it plants new trees in distant places of the earth, and it breaks out into a second life, and stretches out wider than before, and again puts out its leaves, and flowers, and fruit; so that he who before, cried out for the axe and the fire, is now constrained to exclaim, ‘The hand of the Lord hath done it. Behold, this tree is sacred to the Lord. It shall live for ever, and shall not die.’—p. 96-7.

The era of the Reformation was truly the winter of the Church; but she has braved the rigours of that fearful season; she now blossoms in the spring.

In the prosecution of his enquiries to find out the true Church, it appeared to Mr. Lucas that she must be distinguished by two grand features, which are as visible in Scripture as any other article of faith. These are, first, of a Church organization, founded on a principle of authority proceeding from above, depending from the ruler, and perpetuating itself by a perpetual transmission or delegation from ruler to ruler,—and secondly, of a Church organization, involving in itself a principle of unity, whereby the believer may have a certain faith, that he receives through it that portion of the teaching of the HOLY GHOST, which has been promised him in the Church. These features, Mr. Lucas wisely concluded, could be found in that Church only which is entitled to consider itself the heir of the promises of Christ. In the application of these marks, he thus proceeds:—

Now in casting my eyes over the entire history of Christianity, I saw one striking fact which was too obvious to be misunderstood. Anterior to the schism between the Eastern and Western Churches, the great bulk of Christians were united under the supremacy of the bishop of Rome, in a society, the organization of which had been perpetuated by a regular transmission of authority such as I have described, and which contained within itself unity of faith and practice. I found, too, that every collection of individuals who, either before or since, had disunited themselves from communion, with Rome, had most of them, lost this primitive and perpetual organization, had, all of them, cut themselves

off at the same time from the principle of unity. Henceforth, if the principle upon which any one of these schismatics separated from communion with Rome was to prevail, unity of faith was impossible, all certain teaching of the Holy Ghost through the Church was at end, one of the necessary elements of the promised guidance into all truth was destroyed for ever. Look at all and each of the Churches which have separated from Rome. Every one of them contains within itself the principle of discord, of disunion, of diversity of faith. Follow the teaching of any one of them, and the doctrine of Christ is no longer one, but many, varying with colour, climate, longitude, temper, disposition, and parentage. Look again at the Churches in communion with Rome! you behold unity, concord, agreement. You behold also a principle, which, against all human probabilities, in spite of all human risks and dangers, has maintained unity, and agreement of faith, and along with that, vital soundness and energy for the propagation of the faith. Every where else I beheld discord; here, and here only, I beheld concord. Moreover, in the doctrines taught by the Church of Rome, I saw nothing whatever that was in any way at variance with Scripture. I saw, indeed, much, of which only the germ and basis were contained in Scripture, and of which, by my own unassisted reason, I should never have discovered the fulness in Scripture, but I saw nothing whatever at variance with Scripture. I saw, too, that by accepting the teaching of the Catholic Church, a flood of light was thrown upon numberless passages which I had before passed over as unimportant, or as unintelligible. The Bible itself seemed to be lit up with a new and a heavenly splendour.

When from the Church of Rome I turned aside to the other churches of Christians, and I asked myself upon what grounds can I join myself to this or that community, I found the whole enquiry a chaos. Before I could join any one of them, I found that I must become a perfect theologian. The various kinds and properties of grace, predestination and free-will, election and reprobation, the nature and number of the sacraments, the final perseverance of the Saints, the perfection of the Saints, the qualifications, duties, and powers of a Christian minister,—on all these, and a thousand other knotty questions, must I make up my mind before I could join any of the Protestant sects. When I looked to the Anglican Church, I had to be satisfied as to the meaning and orthodoxy of the thirty-nine Articles. Now the meaning of these Articles I could by no means ascertain, seeing that many of them have been studiously contrived, not to express truth accurately, but to include under one general and cloudy form of words as many contrary opinions as possible; and their orthodoxy, I felt myself utterly incompetent to pronounce upon. It was the same more or less in every other sect. I was told to examine, to judge for myself, to exercise my own private judgment, to stand upon my own independence. Of all bodies of Christians (except Friends) the Catholic Church alone told me honestly my own ignorance, my own insufficiency, my own inability to scan and criticize the truths of revelation; alone counselled me to become as a little child; not to set up for a doctor in matters that were too high for me, but to cast aside my own proud independence, and come as a scholar to the school of Christ. In the Society of Friends, indeed, I know well, I was taught the same lesson. I was taught to humble my own human reason before the teaching of the Holy Ghost. But I was there taught also what my own experience contradicted, that this inward teaching without the guidance of the Church would lead me infallibly into all truth; or at least, while telling me of the standing ordinance of the Holy Ghost teaching in the Church, it made it impossible for me to discover which was the true Church, through which I was to receive this teaching of the Holy Ghost. Here, then, I saw abundant reason for a presumption in favour of the Catholic Church, as supplying every guidance that I stood in need of; the Holy Spirit teaching within me, the Holy Spirit teaching in the Church, the sure and certain guidance which Christ has promised into all truth.—p. 65-7.

There was, as it seemed to Mr. Lucas, but one ground upon which this weight of evidence in favour of the Catholic Church, could be at all resisted; viz., the corruption so frequently charged upon her. 'What! I said to myself, and others said to me, will you consent to believe what a Church, so deeply involved in corrupt practices, teaches you? Will you submit yourself to the direction of priests so corrupt and so worldly minded as every Protestant knows the Catholic priesthood to be?' These were strong appeals to his prejudices; and Mr. Lucas confesses that he was staggered for awhile, but a little consideration convinced him that this feeling, this Protestant repugnance, has its origin in pride, of the most vulgar description.

'Our blessed Saviour has promised that the Holy Ghost will teach in the Church to all eternity, but I will not believe what the Church teaches, because some of the rulers of the Church are men of corrupt lives, I will take upon myself to determine at what time the Holy Ghost ceased to teach in the Church; our blessed Saviour and his Apostles have commanded us to obey authorities, to preserve unity in the Church, but I will not obey authorities, I will not preserve unity, because the men who claim obedience are not men whom I can personally respect; these are propositions that sound strange in the ears of any one who has learned the merest rudiments of Christianity.'

‘ Christians were to obey all authority, but were not to be servants of men. They were to revere every one in authority, not for wrath ; not from fear ; not from considerations of merit, which would make all obedience a matter of personal rivalry, and a painful admission of inferiority ; not from an impious pretence that the corrupt ruler was a God ; but for conscience’ sake and as the minister of God.’

‘ And this rule prevailed for centuries, and in the wildest times supplied the place of all outward law. But when the poison of scepticism began to circulate in the veins and arteries of Christendom, when the law of faith and divine reverence began to be weak, when the fervour of the old times began to wax cold, then first was heard in the mouths of Christians that maxim of heathenism—that principle of slavery, under the name of freedom—that manifestation of Satan transformed into an angel of light, ‘ We will obey none but the virtuous. Be they Kings or Popes, Bishops or Emperors, Priests or Lords, when they become corrupt, we will become disobedient.’

‘ Miserable sophistry ! As if obedience and reverence were due from man to man ! from one miserable sinner to the virtue of another, whose own merits could not rescue him from the pit of destruction, from the gulf of eternal condemnation ! Then began men to take in their own minds the measure of the merits of their rulers, and the more malignant each man’s heart was, the less merit did he find in him who enjoined him an unpalatable command. Then the bonds of society began to be relaxed,—the reverence of rank to rank, which had kept each man free within his own order, and enabled him to submit to those of a higher rank without servility. Then men began to envy those above them, not being content ‘ to abide in the same calling wherein they were called’ (1 Cor. c. 7. v. 20.) ; and each man loathing the inward freedom of the Gospel, which consists in obedience and reverence, began to feel that he was a slave, unless every thing above him was violently brought down to his own miserable level. And thus the evil went on from bad to worse, through the various stages of Reformations and servile wars, rebellions, and revolutions, until it ended in the grand crash of the eighteenth century, the worship of atheism, the rule of the guillotine convulsion, anarchy, chaos.

‘ These were the fruits of that zealous preaching of the first grand heresy, which lost us paradise—the heresy of disobedience, which hath proudly called itself the Reformation. Never was there a deeper delusion, than the notion that the Reformation was brought about by the horror of pious men, at the corruptions of the Church. What ! could not these pious men each be pious to himself, taking care to give no occasion of sin in his own example, and where public abuse needed public protestation, protesting, and if need were suffering for his piety, without making a breach in the unity of the Church ? As for matter of faith, the wisest and most learned Protestants in Germany, changed their faith, every year, and to the last, agreed in nothing but detestation of the Church of God. Or were these pious men unable to endure among them the contamination of the vicious, and unable to worship God in the same Church with the impure ? As if the eleven disciples had refused to follow Christ, because Judas was a thief and a traitor ; or because, if they followed him at all, they had to follow him in the company of publicans and harlots ! One might have thought, that a Church which was good enough for Sir Thomas More, and his daughter, Margaret Roper, and Fisher, the bishop of Rochester, and which they found good enough to live in, and which two of them thought worth dying for ; surely such a Church might have contented the immaculate Cranmer, the pious Cromwell, and the devout protector Somerset.

‘ But it was not so to be. The old law of liberty was at an end. Men had drunk to the dregs the cup of servility, which they called independence. Henceforth men were to obey nothing but virtue, in which this world was known from of old to be so rich, even to profuseness. And henceforth, if God had not placed each devout schismatic under governors and rulers, pious and good enough for him, he was to be at liberty, regardless of the Apostolic injunctions, to add schism to schism, and to set up rulers of his own choosing,—rulers who might be more in proportion to his own transcendent merits. This was the new law of the Reformation. There was to be no waiting ; no patience to see the issues of the Divine decree : no meek prayer to God to heal corruptions without breach of unity ; no fear lest breach of unity might unsettle all faith, and by making the rule of faith doubtful, convert men into sceptics and atheists. No ; every man felt himself called upon and qualified to reform a world ; and, according to his ability, stepped proudly forward with his little nostrum,—with his own little modicum of infallibility, denouncing his fellow quacks as instruments of Satan, and pronouncing himself the true Apostle of God. Hence it was, that whole nations became, for the first time in the history of Europe some Atheists, some Unitarians. Others struggling against the dreadful disorder, not wisely, but too well, lost the old liberties of Europe, and sunk down into slavery and inertness. A few only, (and those Catholics,—Belgium for example,) could still shew, as in the olden time, a population, down to the lowest commonalty, devout, faithful, and free. Hence too, many a noble spirit, even in the present day, may be seen wandering in uncertainty and miserable errors, ignorant where true guidance is to be had, sceptic not merely in matters of faith, but it may be in some of the commonest precepts of the moral law, anxiously seeking for truth, and finding only opinion, his whole spiritual nature undetermined and wasted to its core, because the proud spirit of Luther could not brook the

restraint of the Gospel of obedience, nor the brutal appetite of Henry, the obligations of Gospel morality."—p. 67, 69-72.

Of the different claims set up by the adherents of Protestantism, that of antiquity is the most absurd. Its genius is opposed to mysteries and symbols; and its tendency, as experience has demonstrated, is to debase revelation by superinducing upon it a system of pure rationalism. If Protestantism, therefore, had been the original form of Christianity, the result in the early ages would have been the same as that we now witness in the various Protestant communities—a spiritless system of pyrrhonism and indifference: instead of which, Christianity, with the extension of the empire of implicit faith, added symbols and ceremonies, to fix attention upon the things of heaven, and thus kept alive the holy flame of charity which had been kindled at its altars by its Divine founder and His Apostles. Mr. Lucas has well pointed out this radical difference between the old faith and the modern system.

'Protestantism, nor no worship imbued with the spirit of Protestantism, will ever add a type or a symbol to what it has already; nay, it can hardly retain those which it has not thrown off. The tendency of Protestantism is to reject symbols in worship. The tendency of the primitive Church was to assume them. There must then have been a radical difference between the spirit of the worship of the primitive Christians and that of the Protestants, and this difference can be traced to nothing but the sacraments. Plant in a new country the Catholic religion of the sacraments, and of itself it will necessarily issue forth, like primitive Christianity, in a worship of Divine symbols, produced by faith, and nourishing faith in its turn. Plant in a new country the Protestant scheme, and it will gather round it a certain decent regularity of public prayers, and, it may be, eloquent preaching, but nothing more. It could never grow into any form akin to Catholicism. If the primitive worship had been imbued with the Protestant spirit, it could never have issued in Catholicism. Catholic Christianity could never have sprung from a Protestant origin. It had its birth in a nobler region. It hath been sent down from heaven unto the children of men, by the inspiration of the Divinity.'—p. 95.

In his appeal to the 'Friends,' Mr. Lucas has most successfully shewn, that in abandoning Quakerism, they must, upon principle, become Catholics; for Robert Barclay admits that there is no alternative between Quakerism and Catholicism; for a man, he says, must either believe in the inspiration and canonical authority of the Epistle of St. James, or the infallible teaching of the Holy Spirit, or on the infallible teaching of the Church of Rome. 'Let them find a mean if they can:' while, fully alive to the evils of Protestantism, the 'Friends' know nothing of Catholicism, and Mr. Lucas, whose means of information are undoubted, assures us that 'the mass, even of well-informed Friends, know as little of it as they do of the worship of the Moslem or the Hindoo.' Our convert was himself, doubtless, amongst the number. 'To his discovery of the truth he thus feelingly alludes.

'It has been my privilege, and a glorious privilege I know it to be, to be one of the very first to explore this unknown land of Catholicism. Though evil spoken of by the unfaithful spies who from time to time have pretended to give some report of it, I know it to be a land flowing with milk and honey, abounding in the choicest blessings of God. As a child who has lost himself, he knows not where, far from home, returns weeping and weary to his mother's breast, so after long wandering in darkness, seeking for truth but finding no rest, because I could find no certainty, I have at length come, tired out with profitless labour, to find repose and consolation within that temple, whose eternal gates are ever open to invite the weary and erring pilgrim to enter in, and partake of heavenly refreshment. I have accepted the invitation. I have entered in; and within I have found, not the mutilated limbs of truth, but the glorious virgin herself, in all her celestial radiance; so that I cannot but exclaim with St. Austin in the like case, 'Oh beauty, ever ancient and yet ever new! Why have I known thee so late?' Having this knowledge, I should have been an unfaithful witness if I had not at once done my best to send the good tidings abroad. I could not but make known to my friends the blessings which are in store for them whenever they shall choose to make the like experiment with myself.'—p. 98.

Mr. Lucas, anticipating the usual exceptions taken by the Society of Friends to those who quit their body, observes—

'I know it is not uncommon for those who quit the Society of Friends and join any other religious body, to be accused of pride, of a devotion to what is outward, of an aversion to inward spiritual worship, of self-seeking in some shape or other, of too great a reliance on human learning. Now though it may seem to those who are disposed to find fault, to savour of self-praise, yet in order that no such feeling as this may stand in the

way of any person who may be inclined to look more closely into the matter, I will venture to say, that the Catholic religion is at no time peculiarly calculated for the nourishment of pride, and that especially the present is not a time, when an Englishman can make profession of the Catholic faith from any pride or self-seeking whatever: neither can a reliance on human learning, well be supposed to lead a man to renounce his own private judgment, and avow his own incompetence to discuss or decide. Neither, I hope, will it be alleged that an aversion to spiritual worship has seduced me from a worship too spiritual for me, inasmuch as having some little acquaintance with the worship of Friends, I leave it for a worship which I believe to be far more spiritual, not by virtue of the men who compose it, but of the miraculous endowments of heaven.'—p. 98-99.

We find that we have far exceeded the limits we assigned to ourselves in the notice of the 'Reasons,' but we could not resist the pleasure of transferring, rather copiously, some extracts from its eloquent pages. That it will be universally read we have no doubt, and we trust that, by the blessing of God, it will bring many to the knowledge of the truth. On the truly respectable and amiable class to whom it is addressed, it cannot, we think, fail to make a deep impression, for in the Protestant community (for we can place them in no other category we know) there is no body of religionists who aspire so greatly to Catholic spirituality as the Society of Friends; and we are convinced, that if, like Mr. Lucas, any of its members will explore the, to them hitherto 'unknown, land of Catholicism,' they will arrive at the conclusion to which Mr. Lucas has happily come, that in the Catholic Church, and in her *alone*, is to be found the glorious virgin of truth!—*Catholic Magazine for June, 1839.*

FLOWERS FROM THE HOLY FATHER,

No. XIII.

'Dum vestem audio nuptialem, ne de vestimentis quibus induimur, id existimes, sed de bonis operibus.'—*Sti. Euphrem. Serm. 2. De Ascensu.*

THE nuptial robe that all must wear

Who enter to the spousal feast,
Is not a garb for vulgar stare,
With cloth of gold, and samite pieced,
In costly jewels glittering fair,
With rustling pride surceased.

The nuptial robe, which all must don,
Who would their hearts lift up on high,
Who would approach the bridal throne
With contrite heart and suppliant eye,
This robe of praise, and this alone,
Is the fair stole of charity.

The nuptial robe is pure and white,
Unsoiled in deed, unstained in thought,
With willing heart and purpose right
In works of love it must be wrought;
Although 'tis wove with colours bright—
It shall not pass, where love is not.

The nuptial robe, to which is given
An entrance to the bliss of God,
Must raise the soul with virtue's leaven,
Must to the cross point out the road,
And labour humbly, still, till heaven
Itself release the heavy load.

Then clothed anew, in virtue's dress,
Angels shall bid it welcome home—
Then shall the toil that did oppress
Lie buried in its earthly tomb,
When it shall hear that last address
'Ye blessed of my Father come!'

412

THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

‘One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.’

No. XX.

NOVEMBER 16, 1839.

VOL. I.

There is no one, whatever may be his peculiar creed, who pretends to deny, that the Word of God deserves, as soon as announced, our firmest faith and most profound veneration : for it is the voice of a Being whose very essence is Truth. Whether the divine word be uttered in thunder from the clouds, or heard in secret whispers within the sanctuary of the soul ; whether the great master of the world address his subjects in person, or speak to them through inspired ambassadors whom he deposes ; whether preachers of God's mysteries write them on parchment, or inscribe them on the tablet of the heart ; whether, in fine, the word of God be written or unwritten,—it is certain that we ought to receive it with the same unhesitating firmness of belief. For the Word of God is always the word of God, whatever may be the channel through which it is conveyed. Though, however, we may not doubt of the truth of God's word when it is made known to us, we can with reason call in question the purity and soundness of the channels by which Protestants pretend it to be imparted to mankind. The one which they commonly assign is the unattested and unexplained Bible : but as the Bible, unattested, needs itself a sure voucher for its truth, and unexplained, takes a different tinge in passing through minds of different complexions, we look upon it, not only as no *safe* channel, but as no channel *at all*. But if we reject the Protestant one, it is necessary to prove the sound security of our own. The Tradition of Christ's ever-during Church is the Catholic means whereby we receive all the doctrines, whether written or unwritten, which Jesus Christ delivered to his Apostles. If this may deceive us, we cannot, more than Protestants, be certain that we have God's word entire and pure. It is therefore incumbent upon us to show that Tradition is a proper and *infallible* *safe* channel for the conveyance of the divine truths once revealed. Thus two great questions, viz, Tradition and Infallibility, on which every other depends, are here blended together. **CATHOLIC TRADITION IS AN INFALLIBLE CHANNEL** of the Divine truths taught by Jesus Christ.

What is meant by the infallibility of the Church ? Before we define in what it consists, it will be well to declare in what it does not consist.

P P

The infallibility which the Church claims, is not an inspiration which teaches mysteries unknown before : It is not a divine grace by which she receives new doctrines from heaven : It is not a celestial gift, which stamps the seal of truth on whatever new and strange opinions she may think proper to utter : It is not a privilege vested in one man who has only to open his lips and vent forth what he pleases as articles of faith. No ! The Catholic Church claims no prerogative of teaching as a truth of faith the least thing that is new. Her doctrines, like herself, must be all marked with the venerable traces of antiquity, and bear upon them the Apostolic character. In what then does the infallibility of the Church consist ? It consists in these two points ; viz. in handing down, without change, the sacred deposit of faith once delivered to the saints, and in deciding that to be divine truth, which all the churches have received and believed as divine. If in all the churches which compose the Catholic Church, the Faith first delivered be preserved unchanged, it is obvious, after any number of ages, that in all these churches there will be but one and the same faith ; and if again, after the lapse of centuries, it be found that all the churches believe the same truths, it is an unquestionable proof that in no church has the doctrine ever been changed. Hence whatever the unanimous voice of the Catholic Church asserts and defines as divine truth, cannot be otherwise than the precise doctrine of Jesus Christ. Let God, as he has promised, guard and secure the working of these two principles, and behold the infallibility of the Catholic Church !

With respect to the transmission or handing down of revealed doctrine, can anything be more evident, than if the Christians of the first age handed down every revealed truth to those of the fifth—those of the fifth age to those of the tenth—those of the tenth to those of the fifteenth,—that the faith of the Christians in the fifteenth age would accord precisely with the faith of the Christians in the first and Apostolic age ? Can anything again be more evident, than if we, without addition or diminution, transmit the whole faith, which we have received from the Christians of the 15th Century, down to the latest posterity, that the faith of the Christians, who will precede the second coming of Jesus Christ, will tally exactly with the faith of those who immediately followed his first coming, and that thus the whole Christian world will be bound and united together in the same belief ? As the Christian doctrine, in coming from the lips of Jesus Christ, was infallible truth, it is a self-evident proposition that it would always be infallible truth so long as it was faithfully preserved and transmitted without change to posterity. How simple and clear is this first principle of Catholic Infallibility ?

But the next object of enquiry is, how we can infallibly ascertain, whether the doctrine of Jesus Christ has been faithfully preserved and, handed down to the present time. By a principle equally clear and simple as the former :—a principle, which cannot be denied without violating one of the great laws which rule the Moral world, and shaking the sole basis on which the truth of all past events is grounded. It cannot be better expressed than in the words of Tertullian : *what is found to be one among all churches cannot be a deviation from truth, but is a faithful tradition.* When therefore, as soon as any Catholic doctrine is called into question, all the Bishops, with their flocks in the different nations of the earth, protest with one voice, that such is the doctrine they received as taught by the Apostles, you have, in this universal consent, a testimony which cannot

deceive. This consentient voice must be morally infallible ; because truth, which is one, is alone able thus to unite all nations in bearing one uniform and consistent testimony. How grand yet how simple, how true to nature and evident to reason are these two broad principles which form the basis of Catholic Infallibility, viz. 1°. to preserve unchanged and incorrupt, the least article of the doctrine *once delivered to the saints* :—2°. to determine that to be the doctrine thus delivered, which all the Churches unanimously believe, and have for ages believed.

Having descended from heaven to reveal a new religion to man, it was undoubtedly the wish and design of Jesus Christ that every one of his divine doctrines should be kept uncorrupted to the end of the world, and every where believed in **THAT ONE AND SAME SENSE** in which he delivered them to his Apostles. An all-wise being does not propose an end, without adopting the means to achieve it. What means could he adopt ? There were two ; either the one which we have above described, or a fresh revelation of the Christian doctrine to every one coming into the world ; either a preservation of the first great Apostolic Revelation by means of a divinely-aided tradition, or a new individual revelation made by the Holy Ghost to every human being. The last method would be directly against the course of nature, and a continual miraculous violation of her laws. For, in this hypothesis, all men, without receiving any instruction, would be made equally acquainted with the mysteries of faith, and all, like the Apostles, would be endowed with infallibility. No one would be required to teach his neighbour anything, because God in this system would himself instruct all. Though in another order of Providence, Jesus Christ might have adopted this course, yet, that he has not, is too evident from the fact, (to waive other reasons), that, amongst the extravagant sectarians who defend it, there exist such a multiplicity of creeds, and such contradiction of doctrines.

Let us then consider the first method. In this Jesus Christ may be thus supposed to address his Apostles : ‘ I have taught you my religion. Do you go and teach it to all nations. My spirit shall be with you for ever, and shall guard you from error. Let the first Christians whom you shall instruct and admit into my Church, teach this one religion entire to their descendants, and these again to those who shall succeed them, and so on to the latest generation. Their maxim must be, not to lose anything which is old, not to admit anything which is new, but to hand down my whole doctrine just as they have received it. My spirit shall always be with them to keep pure and incorrupt this tradition of my doctrines. If at any time a question shall arise whether any doctrine be mine, let this rule be observed. Follow what the Churches believe, and testify that they have received. The Bishops of those Churches, meeting in council, shall define that to be my doctrine, which is believed by all the Churches over which they preside. Their unanimous decision will be true. But besides, my spirit shall be in the midst of the Bishops when they assemble together in my name, and shall fix my seal of infallible truth on their decision, which founded on a unanimous and consentient testimony, naturally cannot be false.’ How conformable to the laws of nature are these two broad principles, to which, in the Catholic system, Jesus Christ, the God of nature and of religion, would have annexed the gift of divine infallibility !

Though our Redeemer had not intended to assist the Church which he founded with his unerring spirit; though, having established her, he had meant to leave her as it were to herself—exposed to the dangers which threaten the destruction of all human institutions; yet, wishing her to preserve for ages the doctrines which he had taught, what better maxim could he have laid down for her, than to keep unchanged the doctrines handed down from preceding ages; or what better criterion could he have established of any doctrine being his own, than the common testimony of the Churches which compose the Catholic Church? If on the contrary it was his great design (as he expressly asserts) to remain with his church for ever, and to aid her always by his own unerring spirit, where could he have more wisely placed the divine gift of infallibility, with which he meant to endow her, than in the concurrent testimony of the churches, existing in the different nations of the world? For thus, whatever would be infallibly true on divine authority, would be first discovered true on human authority; Faith and Reason thus would walk hand in hand; Grace and Nature would sweetly harmonize together, and human belief would be the easy step by which men might mount to divine Faith.

It is our intention, in some succeeding numbers, to show, how the faithful transmission of Christ's doctrine by means of Tradition, and the certainty of truth, which necessarily results from a unanimous decision of the churches, are conformable to two great principles of nature, which rule the Moral world, and hold society together. This philosophical manner of treating the subject, before we enter upon the scriptural proofs, will not, we flatter ourselves, be uninteresting to our readers, as they will thereby see clearly the *reasonableness* of Catholic Tradition and Catholic Infallibility;—points of faith, which meet with the most violent opposition from those who do not understand them.

We are happy to observe that, in the recent Ministerial Arrangements, announced by the last Overland Mail, three Catholic gentlemen have obtained important appointments; namely, MR. SHEIL, Vice President of the Board of Trade—MR. WYSE, one of the Lords of the Treasury, and MR. MOORE O'FARRELL, Secretary to the Admiralty. This will no doubt excite the bile of the intolerants, and the howl of the No-popey-bigots.

THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE'S NO-POPERY-CHAMPIONS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—With your permission, I shall now resume my notice of the dignified and argumentative epistle of 'ELIA,' which graced the pages of the *Christian Advocate*, of the second instant. I shall not dispute with him about the elevation of the Host, as it is no matter of faith.

'We have been reproached,' says ELIA, 'by Catholics, with eating any article of food made with blood, because blood is forbidden to be eaten by the law of Moses. But how does it consort with propriety for Catholic Priests to drink the Wine of the Sacrament, which they affirm is convert-

ed into *real blood*, while blood, upon their own showing, is forbidden by Scripture. No exception is allowed by the Mosaic Law; but if it be said that the ceremonial law has been abrogated by the institution of the Christian Religion, then Papists must, in consistency, admit that there is no sin in our eating articles of food made of blood.' This is not a bad specimen of ELIA's logic and ingenuousness. But is he not aware that we deem it lawful to eat blood, and to keep holy the first, instead of the last day of the week, upon the authority of Tradition, which he rejects? The Bible, and the Bible alone, is his sole authority, and, according to the *Bible alone*, it is absolutely unlawful for ELIA to perform servile work on Saturday, or to eat black pudding; and if he does those things, he is on his own principle, and in the language of the *Christian Advocate*, 'a sinner and an errorist.'

'It is idle,' this learned man goes on, 'for Catholics to deny the worship of images; for as long as Catholics persist in the practice of kissing the cross, or the feet of any image, with reverence and awe, we cannot be expected to place any reliance in their professions.' And again—'Indeed, the more than ordinary reverence in which the Virgin Mary especially, and all the Saints are held by Papists, affords ample proof that idolatry is an essential feature of Romanism.' Listen to this, ye Papists, and learn from Elia that *kissing, with reverence and awe, is worshipping, and that more than ordinary reverence, is idolatry!!*

Will ELIA be so good as to inform us, when and where the Catholic Church deeming, as he affirms, 'the mediation and intercession of Christ to be insufficient, has declared the mediation and intercession of the Virgin Mary, and the Saints, to be absolutely necessary to secure Salvation?' I wonder if ELIA ever heard of the following bit of advice, '*Speak the truth, and shame the devil.*'

'*Has Christ's hand become shortened,*' ELIA indignantly asks, 'that he cannot save that he should therefore require the aid of the Virgin Mary and the Saints, to deliver his people, *and is his ear become heavy that he cannot hear*, that he should therefore stand in need of the assistance of the Virgin Mary and the Saints, to present to him their prayers?' This is truly a searching question. That we stand in need of the Virgin Mary's prayers, I believe, but that CHRIST STANDS IN NEED of the assistance of the Virgin Mary, and the Saints or any creature, is what I never heard before. Here I may be allowed to ask ELIA, *was God's hand shortened when he required Job to pray for his brethren? And when St. Paul solicited the prayers of the faithful?* Did God stand in need of Job's assistance, or could he not have heard St. Paul without the intercession of the faithful? 'Unless,' ELIA continues, 'the Virgin Mary and the Saints be supposed to possess the attributes of the divinity, it is utterly impossible that one syllable of the supplications addressed to them should be heard by them.' So then this point is at last decided. ELIA knows exactly the LIMIT of God's power in as much as he knows what *faculties* HE CANNOT confer on his glorified and beloved servants. How completely ELIA has here met your arguments contained in the third number, (page 36) of the *Expositor*. 'Either,' he proceeds, 'Christ possesses, or possesses not the divine nature of the Deity; if he does, then he can bear us without the intervention of the Saints, (no doubt of it ELIA,) if he does not, then only is it necessary to pray to him through their medium.' In

the latter case, ELIA, Catholics would deem it a heinous crime to pray to him at all, except to solicit his prayers in the same sense as St. Paul did those of the faithful. ELIA alone can explain what *necessity* or utility there would be in praying to Christ *through the medium* of the Saints, if *he were only a mere creature like themselves*.

ELIA truly informs us that 'truth depends not upon opinion for its value;' but does he not know that the religion of a Protestant consists in nothing but his own vague, uncertain, and wavering opinion, which he may change every day without ever ceasing to be a genuine Protestant. 'It is urged, ELIA observes, 'that, if the Catholic faith were strictly observed, kingdoms would be secure from hostile aggressions, women would be protected without assistance from incontinency, and property would be safe without locks and keys.' This is all very true, good ELIA, but pray inform us when, and in what part of the world, was *the Catholic faith strictly observed* by ALL.

'Again,' says he, 'it is not only Catholicism (Christianity) that deters from vice, by threatening an eternity of punishment, or invites to virtue by promising 'an eternity of bliss,' Mahometanism and Hindooism deal in like denunciations to deter from vice (particularly carnal lust and polygamy,) and hold like incitements to the practice of virtue. What and where then is the boast of Catholicism (Christianity)?' Very bad, ELIA: read Christianity for Catholicity, and your argument will not be a whit the worse, and yet you call yourself a *Christian Advocate*!!!

'Catholics,' ELIA goes on, 'trust to Tradition for the truth of their religion—(since you knew this, ELIA, where was your candour in charging Catholics with inconsistency in eating blood, though it be positively forbidden by the Scriptures?) Mahometanism and Hindooism also trust to Tradition for the establishment of their faith.' Softly ELIA, if you please. Have you never heard of the Koran and the Shasters?

ELIA has discovered that the Pope does many things which St. Peter did not. For instance, His Holiness dwells in a magnificent palace—adorns himself with splendid habiliments—assumes the title of holiness, &c. &c. In short, ELIA's argument may be thus stated:—Pope Gregory the XVI. eats Macaroni, but St. Peter did not eat Macaroni; ergo Gregory the XVI. is not the Successor of St. Peter, Q. E. D. I need not here ask ELIA to show how exactly the Protestant Clergy imitate the poor, mortified, and self-denying lives of the Apostles, for that every body knows—but, to descend to the level of his own reasoning, may I ask him when did the Apostles assume the title of reverend? And what Scriptural authority have the Protestant Clergy for assuming that title?

I presume not to predict what effect Elia's epistle may have in reclaiming Papists; but if, as I presume, it was written with that object, he must feel thankful to me for drawing attention to his arguments which, I am ready to admit, are worthy of his cause. He tells us, and I would not be so impolite as to question his assertion, that 'Papal Rome is Satan's work;' but since ELIA is so familiar with the murkey old gentleman's doing, I would advise him, that is when he is quite at leisure, to read over his own letter, and then seriously ask himself '*who is the father of lies?*'

It would be useless to follow the notorious Faber through all *his facts and assertions*, having already shown their real value. Relying on the fact

that few Protestants ever look at the Catholic side of a controversy, he boldly resorts to the usual artifice of conscious guilt. He endeavours to divert attention from his own base and dishonourable conduct, by audaciously imputing his delinquencies to his opponents. I feel persuaded that no candid Protestant, however strong his aversion to Catholicity, could peruse Bishop Treverns's Supplement to his Amicable Discussion, and Husenbeth's reply to Faber's difficulties of Romanism, without being thoroughly convinced that Faber is an unfair and dishonest controvertist. His charges of misrepresentation have been completely met, and made to recoil on himself with terrible effect. His assertion that Bertram of Corbie and others wrote against the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation has been proved to be unfounded, or in other words to be one of *Faber's facts* and assertions. Of the value of which I shall only adduce one more instance.

Faber stoutly denied that any proof of the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation could be obtained from the writings of the fathers of the three first centuries. Bishop Trevern produced several striking proofs from the Catecheses of Cyril, of Jerusalem, and several other Fathers. Instead of replying to all, as he no doubt would have done, if he had been possessed of materials for destroying their force, Faber leaves them all unnoticed, except St. Cyril, in whose Catecheses he declares that no testimony for the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation is to be found and yet the following is his own translation of a passage from *that very work*: '*The bread which we behold, though to the taste it be bread, is yet not bread, but the body of Christ: And the wine which we behold, though to the taste it be wine, is yet not wine, but the blood of Christ.*' Faber calls this 'apparently decisive!!!'

Again, the same Father observes: 'Since Christ affirmed, and said of the bread, This is my body, who shall any more dare to doubt? And since he confirmed and said, This is my blood, who shall at any time doubt, saying, It is not his blood? He once changed water into wine in Cana of Galilee, by his own nod: and is he not worthy of credit when he changes wine into blood? Invited to a corporeal marriage, he wrought this miraculous prodigy, and shall he not be celebrated much rather when he bestows the function of his body and blood upon the sons of the nuptial couch? Therefore, with full confidence, let us partake of the body and blood of Christ. *For in the type of bread, his body is given to thee: and in the type of wine, his blood is given to thee,*' &c.

'Do not consider the bread and wine as any common things: for they are the body and blood of Christ, according to the Lord's declaration. Although sense suggests this to thee, let faith confirm thee.'

Mr. Faber exultingly asks where in the Catecheses of St. Cyril is it taught, 'that in the Mass a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead is offered up to God.' Now St. Cyril plainly speaks of the sacrifice of the Mass in the following unambiguous terms: '*After this spiritual sacrifice is consummated, (he had just spoken of the consecration) and that unbloody act of worship over that Victim of propitiation, we beseech God for the common peace of the Churches, for the tranquillity of the world, for kings, for soldiers, for allies in warfare, for the sick and afflicted, and, in short, for all those who stand in need of help, we all beseech thee: and offer this sacrifice to thee.* Then we make mention also of those who have fallen asleep before us: first of the patriarches, prophets, apostles, martyrs, *that God would receive our pray-*

ers through their prayers, and supplications. Then for the holy fathers and bishops departed: then we pray for all who have departed from amongst us: believing it to be the greatest help to souls, for whom the prayer is offered, while that holy and tremendous Victim is lying upon the altar.'

'Now, what Mr. Husenbeth asks, 'must the reader think of Mr. Faber? Does not St. Cyril here precisely call the Eucharist a real bloody sacrifice, a victim of propitiation? Does he not here also plainly inculcate its being offered for the living and the dead? Are not here the invocation of saints, and prayers for the dead, as plainly stated as words could state them? Yet in his insulting catalogue of what he calls the Innovations of Romanism, the Rector constantly inserts *Saint worship*, and *Prayers for the dead!*—And here he asks with a tone of defiance where the Neophytes were taught that in the Mass, a true sacrifice was offered for the quick and the dead! Did he really depend upon his readers not being acquainted with St. Cyrils 5th *Mystagogic Catecheses*; and therefore because they might not be so apparent in the 4th, would leave it to be inferred that St. Cyril had not inculcated these things at all? If he did indeed, I have no words to express due abhorrence of such unblushing effrontery, but the strong language of the prophet: 'we have heard of the pride of Moab, he is exceeding proud: his pride, and his arrogancy, and his indignation, is more than his strength.'

A LAYMAN.

Selections.

CURIOSITIES OF LITERATURE BEFORE THE PSEUDO-REFORMATION.

NO. II.

Industry of the monks—in transcribing manuscripts.

'When there were no books in the world but what were written out by hand, with great labour and expense, the method of publishing them was necessarily very slow, and the price very dear.'—*Middleton's Free Enquiry*.—

Without the aid of a pencil like Overbeck's, who paints in the style of the middle ages, and whose pictures are inspired by piety and grace, we despair of being able to convey to our readers an adequate idea of the beauty and splendour of the MSS. during the ages of faith. The chastness of design, delicacy of execution, and richness of colouring of the illuminations, defy criticism, forbid imitation, and beggar description. The missals set aside for the service of the altar, were written in a large bold character, and in size are much like those now used in our chapels. The breviaries designed for the service of the choir were generally smaller; we have seen some as small, or even smaller, than the Husenbeth edition, but whether large or small, they are *uniform* in beauty; the letters are clear, legible, and well formed, and the lines are equally distant from one another. We may account for their beauty by knowing the spirit which guided the monks in their labours; for, whatever concerned the service of God, was executed as if immediately under the eyes of the Almighty. 'Be not troubled at the labour through fatigue,' says Thomas à Kempis in addressing youth, 'for God is the cause of every good work, who will render to every man his recompense, according to his pious intention, in heaven. When you are dead, those persons who read the volumes that were formerly written beautifully by you, will then pray for you; and

if he, who giveth a cup of cold water, shall not lose his reward, much more he who gives the living water of wisdom, shall not lose this recompense in heavens.'

In the richness and splendour of the lettering, few MSS. surpass that termed the *Codex Argenteus*, or silver book. The colour of the vellum is violet, the letters silver, and the capitals gold. For a long time it was supposed that every letter had been stamped singly with hot metal types, but subsequent observation has proved it to have been executed with the pen. The book is a Gothic translation of the Gospels, by Ulphilas, in the fourth century. On the high altar in the cathedral church of Durham, used to be laid a book, called the *Liber Vitæ*, containing the names of the benefactors to the church, which were once a year gratefully recited during the solemnity of the mass. Thirty-four of its leaves are written in letters of gold and silver. In that much calumniated age the tenth century, called by Cave, by way of eminence 'the dark age,' we meet with illuminations to MSS., which would shame many of the productions of the nineteenth century.

There is a book existing, a 'Benedictional,' written by Godemann, who, in the year 270, was appointed first abbot of Thorney, by the founder, Ethelwald, Bishop of Winchester, in which the paintings are a proof of the fact, which will astonish many, that the fine arts in England, in the tenth century, had attained to a high perfection, in their noblest capacity. These figures are drawn in the most graceful manner of the antique, and being surrounded with shining gold and fraught with all the simplicity of the old Christian paintings, they unite the perfection of the classic style and the saintly tenderness of the middle ages. That of our Lord's entrance on Palm Sunday, and the portrait of St. Ethelreda, are of such exquisite grace, that the eyes which bend on them seem never to have their fill.

The subjects of the illuminations are very miscellaneous: in spiritual books they are generally of a religious character, often representations of saints and holy men, the annunciation of some mystery, or the celebration of some festival. From them, too, whatever we know of the costume and dress of these ages, is learned: celebration of games, hunting parties, and historical sketches frequently occur in them. In a MS. translation of the 'Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers,' from the French, by Lord Rivers, is an illumination representing him as introducing Caxton, our first printer, to Edward IV., his queen, and the prince. In the library of Durham is a MS. copy of the Latin Vulgate, in four volumes, given to the monks by Bishop Pudsey. In the book of Maccabees is a representation of numerous warriors arrayed in the armour and costume of Pudsey's period. Prefixed to the New Testament are illuminations, exhibiting every architectural variety of the Norman arch and pier and shaft and pedestal during the period of Pudsey, 1154. The illustrations, to 'Strutt's Sports and Pastimes' are taken mostly from ancient MSS. Were we to mention individually all the curious subjects of illumination, a volume would not contain the fruit of our lucubrations. We pass on to the transcribers of manuscripts.

'In every great abbey,' says Tanner, a Protestant bishop, 'there was a large room called the scriptorium, where several writers made it their whole business to transcribe books for the use of the library. They sometimes, indeed, wrote the leiger books of the house, and the missals and other books used in divine service, but they were generally upon other works, viz., the Fathers, classics, histories, &c. &c. John Wethamsted, Abbot of St. Alban's, caused above eighty books to be thus transcribed (there was then no printing) during his abbacy. Fifty-eight were transcribed by the care of one abbot at Glastonbury; and so zealous were the monks in general for this work, that they often got lands given and churches appropriated for the carrying of it on.' 'The world has never been so indebted,' observes a writer in the *Quarterly Review*, 'to any other body of men, as to the illustrious order of Benedictine monks.' Gibbon, who cannot be supposed to have any itching in favour of Catholicity, observes, that 'a single Benedictine monastery has been of more service to the cause of literature than our two universities of

Oxford and Cambridge together.' Schlegel, a German of extensive acquirements and deep investigation, writes, that during the middle ages more MSS. were translated during the most polished periods of Greece and Rome. Why, then, call those two states civilized, learned, and polished, and the ages of faith barbarous, ignorant, and rude? But we must not expect consistency among Protestants.

Among the Romans, the business of transcription devolved on slaves; and the complaints of Lucilius, Cicero, Martial, and others attest the carelessness with which they executed their task. In the ages of faith, missals and bibles were written by monks of mature age and discretion. Persons qualified by experience and superior learning were appointed to revise every MS. that came from the scriptorium. The collection of the Latin Fathers on vellum, written in the most beautiful characters, and illuminated with exquisite paintings, which is in the Librari Medicea, in the cloister of St. Lorenzo, at Florence, or the splendid choral books and Bible, in twenty two volumes, of the Carthusian monastery of Ferrara, will give an idea of the labour and admirable skill of the monks in this art. Albert was a monk of Cluni, distinguished for the number of beautiful books which he wrote out and bound. The Bible was covered with beryl stones: he had read it through *twice* (whereas the copyers of ancient Rome often did not read them over at all); and, at the end of his labour, he fell at the feet of the seniors of Cluni, beseeching them to pray God for him and for his father, that their sins might be forgiven them.* Richard Berry, Bishop of Durham, in 1333, was celebrated for his exertions in the cause of literature. When Chancellor of England, he used to receive the perquisites of his office in books. Besides several libraries which he had, the floor of his common apartment used to be so covered with books, that it was difficult to approach him. Gerbert, who was afterwards Pope under the name of Sylvester II., collected, at a great expense, a large library of ancient and modern books, caused numerous copies of them to be made, and distributed them wherever he thought they might be useful.

In the Cotton library is preserved a book of the gospels, which is a fine specimen of the Saxon calligraphy and decorations. It was written by Eadfrid, Bishop of Durham, in the most exquisite manner. Ethelwold, his successor, did the illuminations, the capital letters, the picture of the cross, the Evangelists, with infinite labour and elegance; and Bilfred, the anchorite, covered the book, thus written and adorned, with gold and silver plates and precious stones. The work was finished about the year 720. Herman, one of the Norman Bishops of Salisbury, about 1080, used to write, bind, and illuminate books. Did we now-a-days possess no other books but what were copied out by the hand of the worshipful Henry, Lord Bishop of Exeter, how scanty would be our libraries.

In the life of William Caxton, by the Knowledge-Propagation-Society, we are told that MSS. were preserved with the utmost care, guarded against loss equally with their most precious jewels, and never lent, except with the utmost precaution and the best security for their return.†

* These are the men whom our Bible Societies revile for having neglected the Bible. Without them, where would have been the Bible? Surely, at the next Centenary display of Bible mania, the venerable Albert of Cluni will find honourable mention.

† We have confined to a note a few examples of the price of books in the middle ages. They may be gratifying to the student or the antiquary. In the year 1430, one hundred marks, equal to 66*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*, a large sum in those days, were given for transcribing Nichola de Lyra, in two vols., to be chained in the library of the grey friars, London. In 1471, Louis II. borrowed the works of the Arabian physician, Rhazes, from the faculty of Medicine at Paris: as a pledge, he deposited a quantity of valuable plate, and was obliged to procure a nobleman to join with him as surety in a deed. In 1174, Walter, Prior of St. Swithin's, at Winchester, purchased of the monks of Dorchester, in Oxfordshire, Bede's Homilies and St. Augustine's Psalter, for twelve measures of barley and a pall, on which was embroidered the history of St. Birinus converting a Saxon king. Pope Leo X. gave 500 pieces of gold for the five first books of Tacitus's Annals to the monks of a convent in Saxony. We could multiply instances, but these are sufficient to show what expence the clergy went to in the encouragement of literature, and yet how they have been calumniated for their neglect of it.

And again, truth obliges us to add, that many of the abbots, and even monks, employed themselves in procuring or copying the choicest works of Greece and Rome. Yet, with these assertions and facts staring him in the face, the same writer has observed in another place, 'Christianity properly understood, and exercising its due influence on the understanding and character, must be a warm friend of knowledge and literature; but the spurious (?) Christianity, believed and acted upon in the dark ages, was hostile to some of the noblest productions of the human mind.' Where is the authors's proof for this barefaced assertion—we might say, lie?

We have now acquainted our readers with the manner in which books were transcribed and copies multiplied during the ages of faith. Be they Protestants or Catholics, they cannot but admire with us the patient industry, unwearied labour, and anxious exertions for the diffusion of knowledge. But, as we observed at the outset, no adequate idea can be formed of the greatness of these labours, or of the skill of the artists employed to illuminate them, except by those who have seen collections of ancient MSS. Whatever may be their impressions on reading our article, they must be compelled to own that the monks did not lead a life of ignorance, ease, and sloth. No avarice diverted their cause, no lust carried them away to pleasure, no love of ease to delights, no fear of labour to repose.

SAGITTARIUS.

Mount Pleasant.

ON THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

LETTER II.

To the Lord Bishop of Exeter.

MY LORD BISHOP,—Though Protestants may find it too hard a task to inform us how Popery in general got into the church, they may, perhaps, give us a better account of some particular branches of it. I shall, therefore, to avoid being tedious, choose only one of the three I have in my last letter spoken of; I mean the Mass, which, being the most solemn worship both of the Greek and Latin churches, could not easily steal into the world without being perceived, if it had not its beginning from Christ and his apostles. I must likewise observe, my Lord Bishop, that the Mass is, in the opinion of most Protestants, the very rankest part of Popery, and the most hated by them. Witness the sanguinary laws made against it in Queen Elizabeth's time; and, therefore, if Protestantism was established in the world before Popery, I leave any man of sense to judge whether the Mass could get admittance without the greatest difficulty and resistance imaginable. However, I shall give one remarkable positive proof of its antiquity, and I make choice of it because every Englishman who has but read the history of his own country will easily appreciate the force of it. England was converted from Saxon Paganism to Christianity towards the end of the sixth century; that is, about five hundred years before the Norman Conquest, and about nine hundred years before the Reformation. The persons who converted it were sent from Rome by Pope Gregory the Great, and we may be sure preached and established the religion of the place whence they came, which at that time flourished in all parts of the Christian world. The religion they brought over with them continued in England, without any alteration from its first establishment, till the pretended Reformation, as the *Book of Homilies* plainly acknowledges when it tells us, 'that before the Reformation all Christendom had been drowned in abominable idolatry for the space of eight hundred years and more;' for I presume that England was a part of the Christendom it speaks of. Hence it follows, first, that as Popery was the religion of England in the beginning of the Reformation, so it was that very religion to which it was converted nine hundred years before by St. Austin and his fellow-missioners. It follows, secondly, that the Mass and Christianity came

together into England, because, as I have already observed, it cannot be doubted but that they who brought their religion from Rome and received all their directions thence, as St. Austin and his fellow-labourers did, even in things of much less moment (witness holy Bede's *History of England*), it cannot be doubted, I say, but they established the same form of worship in England as was practised at Rome. Now, my Lord Bishop, that the Mass was at that time said at Rome is manifest from St. Gregory, *Hom.* 8 upon the Gospels, where we find these remarkable words:—‘*Quia largiente Domino Missarum solemnia ter hodie celebraturi sumus, loqui diu de Evangelica lectione non possumus.*’ That is, ‘Since, God willing, I shall say Mass thrice to-day, I cannot be very long in my discourse on the Gospel.’ This was spoken by St. Gregory on Christmas Day, which is the only day in the whole year on which every Roman Catholic priest says Mass thrice; and it is an unanswerable proof that the Mass was so well established in the church of Rome at the time when England was converted, that even the custom of saying three Masses on Christmas Day, which is but a point of discipline, was then observed in that church. But it follows, thirdly, that at the time when England was converted, the Mass was the public worship of the whole Christian church, because we read no where that there was any schism or disagreement about that article in Pope Gregory’s time. Here, then, my Lord Bishop, we have a clear and intelligible account that the Mass was established in the whole Christian church *nine hundred years* before the Reformation, and so well established, that no man can, with any colour or probability of reason, pretend it was then a new thing; and if any one should advance it, I can, my Lord Bishop, produce unquestionable authority to disprove him. The most ancient fathers have left us an account of the manner of celebrating Mass in their times. As St. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* 2. (the author of *The Apostolic Constitutions*), l. 2, c. 57, and l. 8, c. 5. &c. *Seq.* St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.* 5, *Mystag.* Besides, all learned men acknowledge St. Basil and St. Chrysostom to be the authors of the Liturgies which bear their names, and are to this day used in the Greek church. The Roman Liturgy is likewise very ancient, as appears from the Sacramentary or Ritual of Pope Gregory the Great, who abridged the Liturgy of Pope Gelasius, a father of the fifth age, and he only put it into better order, with a few inconsiderable alterations made in it. So that any impartial reader will find the whole church at Mass in the fourth and fifth centuries, and a vast number of venerable witnesses to attest it. But I shall, in a few words, trace it even to the third and second centuries, and that, my Lord Bishop, with the help of four substantial Protestant witnesses, I mean the four Magdeburgians or Centuriators, who very honestly own the fact in censuring St. Ignatius, the disciple of St. John; the holy Martyr, Irenæus; St. Cyprian, St. Martial, and Tertullian, for teaching the doctrine of the Mass; ‘the substance’ or ‘essence’ whereof consists precisely in being ‘an unbloody sacrifice offered to God by the priests of the new law upon an altar,’ or, what amounts to the same, ‘an external oblation of the body and blood of Christ under the forms of bread and wine;’ for, as to the ceremonies, they belong only to the decency or solemnity of the service, but are no part of the substance of the Mass, and, therefore, as they were gradually introduced in the primitive ages, so, if the church thought fit, she might even now make alterations in them. This being premised, let us see what the Centuriators have blamed in the beforementioned fathers of the second and third ages. St. Ignatius is censured by them for using these words:—‘*Offerre et immolare sacrificium.*’ *Epist. ad Smirn.* ‘To immolate or offer sacrifice.’ St. Irenæus for saying, ‘That Christ had taught a new oblation in the New Testament, which the church, receiving from the Apostles, does offer throughout the whole world.’ *Iren.* l. iv. c. 32. St. Cyprian is accused of superstition by saying, ‘That the priest is Christ’s representative, and offers sacrifice to God the father.’ *Cyp.* l. ii. c. 3. They reprehend Tertullian for using the words ‘*Sacrificium offerre,*’ ‘to offer sacrifice—’ *L. de Cena Domini.* And St. Mar-

tial for saying, 'That sacrifice is offered to God, the Creator, upon the altar.' Here, my Lord Bishop, is a plain confession of four Protestant writers, that Mass was said in the second and third centuries, and five eminent fathers of those ages are quoted for it. St. Ignatius had received his doctrine from St. John himself, and had been an eye-witness of his actions; and the rest lived so near the time of the Apostles, that I dare presume to say they were somewhat better acquainted with what they had taught and practised than the pretended Reformers, who appeared in the world some twelve hundred years after. Yet then it was that this august and venerable sacrifice, which the prophet Malachi had foretold 'should be offered up to God from east to west,' *Mal. i. 11*, which for near fifteen hundred years together had been the relief of departed souls, the consolation of the just, and the sanctuary of sinners, was, by the impiety of Martin Luther and Co., rendered the object of hatred and of contempt, and banished out of the church, as far as in them lay. However this may be, I am convinced I have proved more than I needed, because my only duty is to put Protestants on their proof concerning the commencement of the Mass. I am but the defendant, they are the plaintiffs. They are, therefore, bound to make good their charges, and shew to the world that the Mass is a Popish invention and has no foundation in the doctrines of Christ and his Apostles; that the primitive church knew nothing of it, and that consequently it had its beginning in some distant age from the time of the Apostles. You cannot help seeing, my Lord Bishop, the moral impossibility of introducing it without the greatest opposition, noise and trouble, in case the primitive church was wholly a stranger to it. I have also to remark, that changes, contests and troubles can never happen in the church or state without being recorded in some history of the times in which they happened. If, therefore, the Mass be without foundation in the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles—if the use of it were unknown in the primitive church—I request, may I implore any Protestant, for the credit and reputation of his cause and the satisfaction of tender consciences, to let Catholics know the names of the writers who lived about the time when the Mass was first brought into the church and have written the history of it; for I presume, my Lord Bishop, it is from them we shall certainly learn who were the first inventors and promoters of it—how, where and when such an extraordinary novelty was first brought into credit; and surely they will not conceal from us one very remarkable particular, viz.—who was the first massing Pope or Priest. I expect, also, we shall be informed what resistance it met with—who were the zealous Protestant bishops who opposed it—what disturbances it raised—in what council it was condemned—and with what reluctance the people were at first brought to be present at it. These and such like remarkable facts would be the subject of historians who wrote in or about the time in which they happened; but if no account of them appears, it is a proof amounting to a moral demonstration that they never happened at all; that the pretended change from a total denial or ignorance of the Mass to an entire establishment of it is altogether fictitious, and that, consequently, the Mass had its beginning from the institution of Christ and the doctrine and practice of the Apostles. According to St. Augustine's opinion, who, writing against the Donatists, gives this for a rule: 'That when any doctrine is found generally received in the visible church, in any age whatsoever, whereof there is no certain author or beginning to be found, then it is sure that such a doctrine came down from Christ and his Apostles.' *De Bap., l. iv. c. 6. 24*; as also *L. De Unit. Eccl. c. 19*. If any one pretend that the Mass crept in by insensible degrees, and so made no noise or disturbance so as to be noticed by any historian, the answer is so very weak that I am almost ashamed to confute it seriously; for first the thing is without example, and I defy your Lordship or any Protestant in the world to produce one single instance of the like nature in any considerable heresy, owned as such by both sides; for, let you name what heresy you please, as that of the Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Monothelites, Pelagians, Donatists, Novatians,

&c. &c., they all caused great disturbances in the church. Histories of them have been written, and we can shew how, where and when they commenced, what progress they made, what fate they met with, and other particulars; and to pretend that Popery alone, supposing it to be a compound of gross errors, or any branch of it, but particularly the Mass, should steal into the church like a thief in the night, is the greatest piece of nonsense that ever entered into a distracted brain. But, secondly, the thing will appear to be altogether impracticable, if we consider how watchful the church has always been in discovering any heresy, and how vigorous in opposing the growth of it; so that many have been suppressed at their very appearance, as Quietism; and it is an undeniable fact, that the church has exerted herself with the same watchfulness and vigour in all ages, without the least regard to the dignity or character of the persons who, by mistake or otherwise, endeavoured to corrupt the purity of the Christian faith. Thus, though Tertullian and Origen were two great pillars of the church in their time, and their orthodox writings are justly valued by all men of learning, yet the church was and is ever watchful to discover the tares among the wheat; and the reputation neither of their great and splendid talents nor immense acquirements could save their errors from being condemned. The same may be said of some errors held by Lactantius, Arnobius, Cassianus and others, which could not escape the watchful eye of the church, and were accordingly censured by her. Nay, what is more remarkable, the error of the holy bishop and martyr, St. Cyprian, who was a man of an extraordinary character, was very warmly opposed and underwent the same fate. So true it is that the church has always been extremely jealous of the purity of her faith, watchful in detecting the least error against it, and inflexible in doing justice upon it. Is it then possibly my Lord Bishop, that a thing so odious to Protestants as the Mass is should either creep into the world without being perceived, or, if perceived, should not be immediately opposed and condemned? Is it probable that the gross errors of Popery should be the only criminals that escaped the hands of justice? But the thing is too gross in itself, so contradictory to experience and inconsistent with reason, that it confutes itself.

If then Protestantism, my Lord Bishop, as opposite to Popery, be the true religion, then it is that religion which was taught by Christ and his apostles, and, consequently, Protestantism had a being before Popery. If so, then it follows that there happened, in some age or other, an entire change from Protestantism to Popery which was in possession of the whole church for many hundred years. But it is morally impossible that such a change should happen without opposition, nay without causing great disturbances both in the church and in the state; and it is without example that such considerable events should neither be recorded in any history written about the time when they happened, nor transmitted to posterity by writers of the following age. Therefore, my Lord Bishop, if Protestants cannot produce any such history, and it is quite certain they cannot, then the pretended change from Protestantism to Popery is wholly groundless, and, consequently, the religion of the Church of Rome comes direct from Christ and his apostles, and her enemies are guilty of as many calumnies as they lay errors to her charge. And I here most positively assert, my Lord Bishop, that, if the authority of the church be taken away, religion will not have one leg to stand on! What a large and noble field does not the Protestant doctrine of Private Judgement lay open for the Free-thinker to exert himself in and endeavour to triumph over the church. Must not Free-thinking break in upon us like an irresistible torrent, when the church, whose wisdom and authority in interpreting Scriptures should be the main bulwark against it, is refused to be listened to by your pretended Reformers? Yes, you all allow yourselves to be fallible; not one of you believe the same; you are continually contradicting yourselves—one believing this and another that. In fine, what idea must we have of a church whose judgment is represented to us as built upon weakness and upon fallibility? Surely, Christ never.

meant to establish such a church as this, when he made her the solemn promise, that 'he would be with her even till the end of the world,' and designed her to be our guide to heaven and lead men to salvation,

I am, may Lord Bishop,
Your obedient Servant,

April 7, 1838.

VERAX.

[*A Catholic Layman.*]

P. S.—The learned Cardinal Bona, who flourished in Rome in the 17th century, says,—'There is an epistle (acknowledged to be genuine) of Pius I. to the Bishop of Vienne, written about the year 166, in the opening of which he thus speaks:—'Our sister Euprepia, as you will recollect, has made over her house to the poor, where we dwell and celebrate Mass.' *Con. Gen.* tom. i., p. 576. In a letter addressed to another Bishop, and written in the year 254, Pope Cornelius also remarks that, 'on account of the persecutions, Christians could not publicly celebrate Mass.' *Ibid.*, p. 681. St. Ambrose, writing to his sister, mentions the Mass, as likewise in his 34th Discourse, he says, 'I exhort you to hear Mass daily.' *Tom.* v., 48.

Formerly it was the custom in the Protestant church also to mingle water in the cup, and the omission was strongly reprehended by many of its most learned divines on the ground of the practice being derived from apostolical tradition. (See *Reasons for Restoring Some Prayers, &c. and Defence of Ditto*. London, 1817.) The Commemoration of the Saints is a practice which, through ancient Liturgies may be traced back to the very days of the apostles. Hardly the fragment of a Greek, Syriac, or Arabic Liturgy can be produced without evidence for it. 'I receive (writes the great St. Basil) the holy apostles, prophets, martyrs, and invoke them that they may pray for me, and that, by their means, God may be merciful to me and forgive me my sins; on this account I honour and respect their representations, for all these things have been ordained for us by the traditions of the apostles.' *Ep.* 205 t. iii. *Ed. Par.* p. 224. Even the English Protestant church was once in unison with the Catholic on this head. The prayer for the whole church, in the 'Protestant Communion Office,' formerly contained the following passage:—'And here we do give unto thee most high praise and hearty thanks for the wonderful grace and virtue declared in all thy saints from the beginning of the world, and chiefly in the glorious and most blessed Virgin Mary, mother of thy Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord and God; and in the holy patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs, whose examples (O Lord) and steadfastness in thy faith and keeping thy holy commandments grant us to follow. We commend unto thy mercy (O Lord) all other thy servants,' &c. The Collect for St. Michael's Day, in the *Book of Common Prayer*, is as follows:—'Oh! everlasting God, who has ordained and constituted the service of angels and men in a wonderful order, mercifully grant that, as thy holy angels always do thee service in heaven, so by thy appointment they may succour and defend us on earth, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.'

For God's sake, Protestant reader, open your eyes and tell me candidly if all this be not the rankest Popery? Still Catholics are blamed and calumniated for doing nothing more or less than this!

PENALTIES ON IRISH PAPISTS.

The following are a few of the laws passed in the reigns of Anne and George I. and George II., for the purpose of rooting out popery in Ireland, and seven millions of Catholics now bear witness to their effects:—Popish fathers were prohibited from being guardians to their own children conforming, however young, to the Protestant religion. No Protestant could marry a Papist, having an estate in Ireland. The estate of a Papist was to be divided after his death among his children, and in failure

of children, among his collateral kin. Papists were excluded from residence in Galway and Limerick. Voters at elections were obliged to take the oaths of allegiance, abjuration, and supremacy; consequently Papists had no vote. No Papist could take an annuity for life. Papists teaching either publicly or privately were to be prosecuted as Popish regular convicts. Popish priests, on conforming, were to receive a stipend of 30*l.* per annum, till better provided for in the Protestant church. The following rewards were offered for discovering Popish clergymen and school masters. For an archbishop or bishop, 50*l.*, for a priest, 20*l.*; and for a school-master, 10*l.* No Papist was to take more than two apprentices, except in the linen trade. Papists were prohibited from being on grand juries. Papists were to find Protestant substitutes for the militia, and to pay double. They were prohibited from being high or petty constables, barristers, and solicitors. Marrying Papists were to be subject to all the penalties on Papists. Marriages between Protestants and Papists, or those celebrated by Popish priests, were annulled. Popish priests celebrating marriages between Protestants and Catholics were to be punished capitally! 'Such,' says Mr. M'Culloch, 'are the principal clauses of the Anti-Catholic penal code, probably the most atrocious system of tyranny and persecution ever established in any European country.' When we add, that the whole of Ireland, with the exception of the estates of five or six families, has been confiscated once, and no inconsiderable portion twice or thrice, in the course of a century, and the estates given to Protestants, can any one wonder that the Irish Protestant Church has long been and still is regarded by Catholics as a badge of slavery and conquest?—*Chester Chronicle*.

AIRDRIE.—In this thriving burgh, the centre of a numerous and manufacturing population, a new Catholic Chapel, on a large scale, has lately been begun. The foundation stone was laid about the middle of April. The erection of this chapel would have commenced somewhat earlier, but for the bigotry of the proprietors of the stone quarries in the neighbourhood, who would not furnish materials, at any price, for popish buildings! Owing to this narrow-mindedness of some Airdrie men, the poor Catholics are under the necessity of bringing stones from a distance, which will add considerably to the expense of the chapel.—*Catho. Mag. June. 1839.*

THE GOSPEL.

The Gospel 'tis which streaks the morning bright,
'Tis this which gilds the horrors of the night;
When wealth forsakes us, and when friends are few,
When friends are faithless, or when foes pursue;
'Tis this which wards the blow or stills the smart,
Disarms affliction or repels its dart.
Within the breast, bids purest raptures rise—
Bids awful conscience spread her cloudless skies;
When the storm thickens and the thunders roll,
When the earth trembles to the affrighted pole,
The virtuous mind no doubts, nor fears assail,
These storms are zephyrs, or a gentler gale.
And when disease obstructs the lab'ring breath,
When the pulse trembles, and each gasp is death;
E'en then religion shall sustain the just:
Grace their last moments, nor desert their trust.

A.

Printed by Messrs. W. Rushton and Co., Calcutta, for the Proprietors
price one rupee per month, or ten rupees per annum in advance. To non-
subscribers 8 annas per number.

THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

'One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.'

NO. XXI.

NOVEMBER 23, 1839.

VOL. I.

We are happy to announce to our fellow Catholics, that the 'Institution of the Propagation of the Faith' has begun to extend itself to this country; and we are proud that Calcutta has been the first city, in this part of the world, to take up this noble work of Catholic charity. It was proposed on Sunday sevensnight in the College Chapel of St. Xavier's; and the appeal was so well responded to, that upwards of two hundred and fifty contributions have been received already. The Right Reverend Vicar Apostolick of Bengal gives his gracious patronage to this 'pious work,' and his warmest wishes for its success; and authorises a gentleman to discharge the duties of its Secretary, until the Central Council of Lyons shall sanction the formation of a Branch Council here. It is recommended to the zeal of every Catholic in Calcutta, and wherever this notice may reach, of every state and condition, to unite in the pious undertaking himself, and to engage as many members as he shall be able among his friends and acquaintances. It is recommended with greater confidence, in as much as its primary object is, to supply—what is the greatest want of this country—missionaries, and aid for missions in this desolate portion of the Church. The spiritual advantages are very great; the conditions, of which there are but two, are of easiest fulfilment. Let each one strive to make himself the collector of a decade, or ten subscriptions; and, if resident in Calcutta, or its vicinity, let him transmit to the Secretary the monthly amount, along with the names of the contributors: if residing in the country, let collectors of decades unite together, if possible, a hundred contributions, or as many as they shall be able, and send immediate notice of the establishment of this charity in their district to the Secretary, from whom they shall receive instructions how to act, and every other information they may desire.

Only, Catholics, unite! Let no one think his own contribution, however small, to be unimportant: it was the aggregate of such contributions that swelled the receipts of last year to the amount of one million three hundred thousand francs, and sent forth its succours to the farthest limits of the earth. Let no one imagine that he is invited to partake in a charity that is foreign to him. We are living here amidst the *foreign*

missions which the association exists to aid. Fear not : our tens will return to us encreased a hundred or a thousand fold. Already have the vast missions that surround us drunk largely from its sources : Siam, Ava, Pegu, Agra, Madras, Madura, Verapoli and Cochin owe their thousands to its generous benevolence ; and their enlisted names attest its wide-working influence. The name of Bengal has not yet appeared upon its Annals ; but it shall first be registered there in the long list of its supporters—as one argument more of the Catholicity of that Church, that belongs to all nations. Soldiers ! this work should be as dear to you, as is the aid of British clergymen you seek so much for. Priests ! we have not to explain its usefulness to you : your mouldering altars, your unschooled congregations, speak it loudly enough. We shall soon have the consolation of laying before our readers the news of its adoption in various parts of the country, and in the neighbouring presidencies. We annex the encyclical notice of the 'Institution,' and beg to refer our readers for further information to the Secretary, FRANCIS PEREIRA, Esq. at the Office of Messrs. Gilmore and Co., or at his residence, No. 4-2 Loudon Street, Calcutta.

INSTITUTION FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE FAITH TO AID THE FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The sole object of this pious and charitable undertaking is to assist by prayers and alms the Catholic missionaries, who are charged to preach the gospel to foreign nations.

Productive of glory to God, of benefit to man, of merit to our own souls, it holds a distinguished place among those great institutions for which we are indebted to the spirit of faith ; and with the blessing of heaven, no opposition can ever check its progressive prosperity ; more than sixty missions in different parts of the world offer up their grateful prayers for the success of an institution, from which they have already received the most efficient aid.

Other religious undertakings have each their special object and special claims on the charity of the public ; in this, without exaggeration, the noblest undertaking of modern times, is comprised all that enhances the merit of any ; and hence we may confidently look forward to its speedy and universal diffusion among all classes.

It is a work of faith, as announced by its title. It owes its birth to that faith, which stimulates the missionary to carry the glad tidings of salvation to the extremities of the earth, and in the accomplishment of his noble task, teaches him to disregard his own ease and comfort, and accept with pleasure the sufferings of the mission. In his labours and privations faith does not call upon all to take a share ; but it enables us to appreciate and to participate in their merits. Our divine Redeemer has said that 'his gospel would be preached throughout the world, as a testimony to all nations* ;' this divine prediction must be fulfilled, the establishment of missions is the means of its accomplishment, and the Christian who contributes to their support bears testimony to the faith of that God, whose disciple he professes to be.

It is a work of zeal. It solicits to the co-operation of all, who feel 'zeal for the law and for the house of the Lord,' who desire to witness the triumph of the Cross, and the firm establishment of the Church on the ruins of idolatry, infidelity and heresy.

'Here,' exclaims Fenelon, 'is an institution established by God for the glory of his gospel ; it imparts to the Church that striking characteristic, which

* St. Matthew, c. XXIV, v. 14.

every eye may see, and which points out to the most ignorant where the true doctrine may be found; we show to our erring brethren the true Church, as St. Austin did to the sectaries of his day. This is the city placed on the top of the mountain which is seen at a distance by all the people of the earth; this is the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, which embraces all nations*.

It is a work of charity, of the most sublime and extensive character.

Educated in the bosom of christianity, accustomed to the quiet and tranquil possession of those blessings which its mild and civilizing influence sheds upon society, we know not, we can scarcely conceive, the multifarious miseries under which the idolator labours. Sympathy for his sufferings should arouse us to ameliorate his temporal condition by introducing the religion of truth and its consequent improvements. Thus indeed would be accomplished a work of charity, and what is infinitely more important, thus would be opened to the pagan and to the idolator the path of eternal salvation; thus shall we escape the malediction so much dreaded by St. Paul, when he pronounced those emphatic words: 'Woe to me, if I do not evangelize†' and finally thus shall the mercy we extend to others, return to fructify among ourselves. Already have the salutary effects of this charitable undertaking been experienced by its supporters. Their faith is rendered more lively; their zeal is roused by the successful and happy results of their exertions; their pious curiosity is excited by the frequent and affecting reports of the missionaries; and they find that if they send preachers and instructors to the idolatrous nations of the East and of the West, those nations in their turn send back a species of living instruction in the examples of primitive fervour and heroic virtue, which they supply.

Such is the Institution for the Propagation of the Faith, whose progress and success have been equal to what might have been expected from so simple and beneficent an undertaking. Founded at Lyons in the year 1822, it soon spread throughout all France, and was quickly adopted by Belgium, Holland, Portugal, Switzerland, Savoy, Piedmont, Italy, Germany, Russia, and the Levant, all of which have transmitted their contributions to the parent institution in France. Though introduced into England only within the last year, yet a considerable sum has been already remitted from that country: in the month of March 1837, the sum of 729,867 fr., received by the different committees, was distributed in proportion to their wants, among the missions of the following empires, countries and cities, to wit:

China, Cochin-china, Tong-king, Corea, Camboja, Siam, the coasts of Coromandel, Thibet, Cochin and the East Indies;

The Grecian Archipelago, Constantinople, Smyrna, Tyne, Syra, Chio, Armenia, Syria and mount Carmel; Pegu and Ava; the United States of America; Hudson's bay, Nova Scotia, Guiana, Upper Canada, Labrador and Newfoundland;

And, finally, the numberless archipelagoes of the Pacific Ocean.

In the 58th number of the Annals, which appeared in May, will be found the exact sum given to each of these missions from the receipts of 1838.

The Annals of the Propagation of the Faith contain the most interesting and instructive matter. Without taking into account the light they throw on the history, geography, usages and customs of so many nations, the pious Christian, who is delighted and edified with the heroic conduct of the martyrs in the early ages of the Church, finds enough to enkindle in his soul the fire of devotion, when he sees men in his own days bid adieu to their families and their friends, and go, with the cross in their hands, and poverty and privation as their portion, to preach the religion of Christ to the savage wanderer of the desert.

* Sermon preached in the church of the Foreign Missions, Paris, in presence of the Siamese ambassadors.

† Epist. to the Corint. c. IX, v. 16,

Entire nations, animated by the most promising dispositions, loudly call upon us to send them evangelical labourers. The task is important; the mission is sublime: to ensure its success, we must not only add the mite of our individual subscriptions; we must zealously endeavour to extend the knowledge and multiply the supporters of this grand enterprise; we must call upon our relatives, our friends and our acquaintances; and our united prayers will change 'the stones into children of Abraham,' and our half anna per week will become the ransom of an idolatrous world.

To co-operate with this great work, only two very simple things are necessary:

1^o To say, with this intention, the Pater and Ave of our daily morning or evening prayer, and to add each time the following invocation: 'St. Francis Xavier, pray for us.'

2^o To contribute towards the missions one half anna per week.

By these two conditions, which can be so easily observed, we are entitled to many indulgences; we participate in the merits of the missionaries and of their converts; we acquire a share in the splendid rewards promised by the Scriptures to works of charity; and we become useful to the Church at large by consolidating and extending the immense benefits it has already derived from this Institution.

For the purpose of greater facility, one member is charged to receive the subscriptions of ten, the amount of which he hands over to another member, who receives ten similar contributions, that is, a hundred subscriptions; and he in his turn gives the entire sum to a third member authorised to receive ten such contributions, that is, a thousand subscriptions: this plan authorises no association among the subscribers.

Donations made by persons not members, or by members over and above the ordinary subscription, will be gratefully received.

Two committees (*conseils*), established one in Paris, the other at Lyons, superintend the allocation of the funds to the different missions: a return of the receipts and of their appropriation is published every year.

Whatever may regard the missions of the old or new world, is published by the 'Propagation of the Faith,' in France, where it has become their common centre; it keeps up an uninterrupted correspondence with them; it receives, and, under the superintendence of the two committees above mentioned, draws up and publishes, under the name of the 'Annals of the Propagation of the Faith,' the reports of their labours and exertions. This collection, which completes the continuation of the 'Letters édifiantes,' presents a lively picture of the state of religion in the two hemispheres; it appears six times a year, and contains also an annual return of receipts and of their appropriation, as well as all the documents relative to the Institution; a number is distributed gratuitously every two months to ten subscribers; it is given to them in succession by their collector, whose property it ultimately becomes.

All charitable persons into whose hands this prospectus may fall, are particularly requested to make known its contents to those who are not yet subscribers, and in those places where the Institution has not yet been heard of.

Indulgences granted to the Institution.

The Sovereign Pontiffs Pius VII, Leo XII, Pius VIII and Gregory XVI, by their rescripts of March 15th, 1823, May 11, 1824, September 18, 1829, and September 25, 1832, have granted to all the members of the Institution for the Propagation of the Faith, in the dioceses where, with the consent of their respective bishops, it shall be established both in France and in all other places in communication with France, the following indulgences applicable to the souls in Purgatory:

1^o A plenary indulgence on the festival of the finding of the Holy Cross, the anniversary of the first establishment of the Institution at Lyons in the

year 1822; on the festival of St. Francis Xavier, Patron of the Institution* ; and once a month, on any day at the choice of each subscriber, provided he says every day within the month the appointed prayers.

To gain the indulgence, he must be truly sorry for his sins, go to confession, receive the holy communion, and visit devoutly the church or oratory of the Institution, if it has one; and if not, his parish church or chapel, and there offer his prayers for the prosperity of the Church and for the intention of the Sovereign Pontiff. In case of sickness or infirmity, subscribers are dispensed from the visit to the parish church, provided they fulfil, to the best of their power and with the advice of their confessor, the other necessary conditions. Where the Institution is not yet established, a visit to any church or chapel will suffice.

2^o An indulgence of a hundred days, each time that the prescribed prayers with at least a contrite heart be repeated; or a donation made to the missions; or any other pious or charitable work performed.

By a rescript, dated November 15, 1835, his Holiness Gregory XVI. has allowed to all France and to all places communicating with France for the furtherance of this great work:

1^o That the indulgences granted to the Institution may be gained once, either on the day of the above mentioned festivals, or on any day within their octaves.

2^o That these indulgences may be gained on the days appointed by the Bishop for the celebration of the festivals abovenamed.

By another rescript of his Holiness, dated January 22, 1837, the plenary indulgences granted prior to that period can be gained on the days, to which, in consequence of the concurrence of another festival, the festivals of the Holy Cross and of St. Francis Xavier may be transferred; and also during the octave, whether they be transferred or not.

2^o They are extended to all persons of every nation, who subscribe to the French Institution for the Propagation of the Faith.

3^o When travelling, any other church or approved chapel can be substituted in place of the parish church.

4^o Persons living in cloistered communities, labouring under sickness, in prison, at sea, or otherwise prevented from visiting their parish church, or any other church or approved chapel, can gain these indulgences by praying during half an hour for the intention of the Sovereign Pontiff, and by fulfilling the other necessary conditions.

5^o All these indulgences are applicable to the souls in Purgatory. To invoke the benediction of Heaven on the labours of the missionaries, as well as on the Institution, to which they look for support, a Pater and Ave are said every day. It will suffice to say for this purpose, once for all, the Pater and Ave of our daily morning and evening prayer, and to add the following invocation: 'St. Francis Xavier, pray for us.'

We have much pleasure in laying before our readers the following prospectus of St. Xavier's College, which acquiring fresh life and vigour from the accession of newly-arrived Professors from England, will henceforth be conducted on the same system as obtains in similar Institutions in Europe. It would, we are convinced, be quite superfluous in us to say a single word in commendation of this excellent Institution, for it is the only one in Bengal which affords to Catholic children, the benefit of a superior education, combined with moral and religious instruction. Such an Institution was long a most serious desideratum in this country, and we are

* The Propagation of the Faith having selected those two festivals, as special periods for prayer and thanksgiving, a solemn high mass will be said, on each of those days wherever the Institution is established, all subscribers are requested to assist at it.

happy to infer, from its already prosperous state, that its advantages, and the zealous exertions of its learned conductors, are duly appreciated by the Catholic community, to the rising generation of whom it cannot but prove an inestimable blessing :—

A. M. D. G.

SAINT XAVIER'S COLLEGE.

UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF

THE RT. REV. J. L. TABERD, BP. OF ISAUROPOLIS, AND V. A. BENGAL.

I. Saint Xavier's College was instituted by the Fathers of the Society of Jesus who in 1834 were sent by His Holiness to support the cause of religion in the city of Calcutta. It owed its first establishment to the pious generosity of two rich residents; one of whom vacated and gave up his own house for this purpose, and the other furnished the college throughout and bestowed a liberal pension for its support during the first months of its existence.

II. The necessity of its immediate institution at the very commencement of the mission was evidenced by the absence of any catholic college in the whole extent of India: that necessity was imperiously enforced by a powerful system set to work some years before with abundance of high patronage and support, and pursued, avowedly, with an activity that threatened to overwhelm the abandoned remains of catholicity in this country.

III. The object of this institution is to throw open to the higher classes of the catholic youth, under the direction and tuition of professors of their own religion, a course of liberal education which shall form the character; inspire a love of the social and religious virtues; and fit for the various duties of after-life. Nevertheless, this institution is open alike to youths of other religious persuasions, who may live in it, or frequent its schools, free from coercion and religious animosity.

IV. The course of the studies, subject to some adaptations to the wants of this country, is similar to that pursued in the great colleges in Europe: it embraces classical literature and the ancient languages;—English and modern languages; and eastern languages;—exercises in composition and elocution:—the various branches of polite literature:—the exact sciences, with their higher departments and relations:—chemistry and philosophy.

V. All the scholars are closely examined every quarter: the general annual examination takes place immediately before the vacation, at which prizes are bestowed upon those who shall have acquitted themselves successfully in three of the quarterly examinations, and upon those who shall have distinguished themselves in composition.

VI. The vacation commences on the ninth of September, and ends on the tenth of October. A week's holidays are allowed from Christmas until New-year's-day; and some days at Shrovetide, Easter, and Whitsuntide. The school hours are from half past eight till four; one thursday in each month is a holiday: on the other thursdays the school closes at noon.

VII. Particular care is bestowed to inculcate the principles and practice of morality. To succeed in this essential point of education, the directors, who are Europeans forming a religious community, twelve in number and always resident in the college, exercise a perpetual vigilance over their charge: the scholars are never removed from the care of a superior; they are accompanied out to walk; they are forbidden to make visits to, or to receive visits from any but such as their parents expressly desire; they are not permitted to be withdrawn from the college to spend the day at their homes, or at the houses of their friends, on any other than the appointed monthly holiday: when departing after breakfast, they are to return before dusk: and they

must be accompanied both on their going home, and on their return to college.

VIII. The health of the young gentlemen is entrusted to the care of a very experienced physician. The college stands in a very airy and healthful situation opening upon the Esplanade, whither the scholars resort for their juvenile exercises. The food of the scholars is wholesome, plain and abundant, the quantity being permitted to their own discretion. To this, and to the regularity of their hours is, under the blessing of God, attributable the strong health which they have constantly enjoyed.

IX. Children are admissible at the age of seven years: if much beyond that age, or having been inmates of any other house of education, they must have from the superior of that house an attestation of their morals and docility. Those that are not resident in Calcutta must be provided with the written engagement of a respectable resident agent to pay for their education and to take charge of them, in case that infirmity or other cause should render their removal from college necessary. Applications for the admission of scholars are to be addressed to the Rector.

It is in contemplation to open a separate house for the reception of such children as have not attained their seventh year, or whose delicate health requires particular attention and treatment.

X. Boarders shall pay twenty-five rupees per month; day boarders, sixteen-day-scholars, eight. These payments shall be made quarterly in advance. They do not include medicines, clothing, washing, school-books or stationery.

Towards the close of each quarter, parents will receive through their children an account of their proficiency, application and conduct, together with a receipt for payment of the extra charges of the past, and of the ordinary charges of the ensuing quarter: and on his return to school on the first day of the quarter, each scholar shall bring with him the receipt discharged to be countersigned: in default of which, he shall be considered as having left the school.

XI. To quit the college a month's notice, or a month's fee in lieu, is required: subject to this rule, those who leave the college before the expiration of a quarter, shall receive back the monies advanced for the remaining portion of the term. No deduction will be made for absence from the college during the vacations. Lessons in musick and drawing, and postage form extra charges.

XII. Every scholar shall bring with him a suit of warm clothing; a dozen and a half of lighter suits, shirts and socks: a dozen towels and handkerchiefs; and two pairs of shoes; a cot, six sheets, and a coverlid. Any deficiency shall be charged to the parents.

The address is,—ST. XAVIER'S COLLEGE,
Chowringhee, Calcutta.

His Lordship, THE RIGHT REVEREND DR. CAO, Bishop of Zama, Vicar Apostolic of Ava and Pegu, arrived in Calcutta a few days ago, *en route* to the 'Eternal City,' via Egypt.

With reference to a subject, that we touched upon about a month since, we have much satisfaction in re-publishing a correspondence that has lately taken place between his Lordship, the Vicar Apostolic of Madras, and all the Catholic Bishops in British India; besides the letters and opinions of the other respectable divines. In our present number, we give the circular of Dr. O'Connor, and the first reply to it; the others will successively follow, all translated from the original Latin, except the two last.

MARTIN LUTHER, THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE'S DEMI-GOD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—Your contemporary of the *Advocate*, smarting under the lash, which I inflicted on him a short time ago, for belauding the Arch-Reformer, while in the same breath denouncing the Fathers and Councils, has returned to the contest, exclaiming that 'one of the great efforts of the advocates of the papacy is to calumniate the private and public character of Martin Luther. This, they do not hesitate to attempt, *by quoting garbled statements* from his writings, and circulating the most absurd, and wicked stories concerning him, as though they were accredited facts.'

This is a bold assertion, and I defy the editor of the *Advocate* to establish any particle of the above subtle declamation. I refer him to my letter, which appeared in the *Expositor* of the 31st August last, in which I gave a full character of that incomparable Patriarch of the Reformation, drawn by *himself*, and some of *his* disciples. In the long list of testimonies given therein, of Luther's *public* and *private* character, I challenge the *Advocate* to prove a single garbled statement. If he cannot do so, then I am justified in asserting that though the editor professes to be a Christian Pastor, he has yet to learn one of the first duties of a good Christian—'*Do not bear false witness against thy neighbour.*'

I would also recommend the worthy editor to refresh his memory by a reference to my letter, which appeared in the *Expositor* of the 7th September last, in which I proved, from *Luther's own writings*, that he thought that DRUNKENNESS was a very good antidote against the temptations of the devil, and that he recommended a clerical friend to '*Drink Freely*', when assailed by the devil. Further let him look to the confessed intimacy of Luther with Satan, published in the same issue, and let him prove, if he can, one iota of the statements to be *false* or *garbled*.

When you, Sir, convicted the *Advocate* of gross misquotation of the words of St. Ignatius, you were particular in giving the Greek text, to establish your proof. Why then should your opponent be allowed to denounce any statement false, without proving it to be so? Oh, how long will he gull his readers thus!

AU REVOIR.

Selections.

CIRCULAR LETTER ADDRESSED BY THE RIGHT REVD. DR. O'CONNOR, TO THE VICARS APOSTOLIC OF INDIA.

MOST ILLUSTRIOUS AND REVD. LORD.

I forward to your Lordship a copy of the authenticated Apostolic Brief '*Multa Præclare*,' together with a letter, which, on account of the difficulties to which the Roman Catholic Religion is reduced in this Vicariate, I have judged necessary to write, both to your Lordship and to all the other Vicars Apostolic of the East Indies. It will conduce much to the welfare of religion, if your Lordship will condescend to send such an answer to me

as may show clearly and perspicuously—1st: whether the Brief ‘*Multa Præclare*’ is authentic and have authority. Secondly: whether in virtue of that Brief, you acknowledge me, and no other, as the Vicar Apostolic and Ordinary, to whom alone the care of the R. C. Church of Madras and Meliapore both in spiritual and temporal concerns lawfully and canonically belongs. Thirdly; whether all those Priests and Lay persons who resist my authority, and impede me in the administration of the spiritual and temporal concerns of the Churches committed to me, be not guilty of rebellion against the Supreme Head of the R. C. Church, and whether they are not to be treated as Schismatics separated from the communion of the Church, notwithstanding what these Schismatics vainly allege both concerning the right of Patronage of the Queen of Portugal in these Countries, and concerning the Concordates formerly entered into between the Sovereign Pontiffs and the Kings of Portugal.
Your Lordship's most devoted Brother in Christ

+ DANIEL O'CONNOR,

Madras, May the 4th, 1839.

Bp. of Salditan.

To the most Illustrious and Revd. Lord N. N. Vicar Apostolic &c. &c. &c.

The following is the reply received from his Lordship the Right Revd. CL. BONNAND D. D. Bp. of Drusipare, and V. A. on the Coromandel coast, &c. together with its translation.

MOST ILLUSTRIOUS AND RT. REVD. LORD.

I have received a letter from your Lordship, dated 4th of this Month, and directed to the Vicars Apostolic of the East Indies, together with a copy of the authenticated Apostolic Brief ‘*Multa Præclare*.’ I rejoice and will rejoice at the precaution which the Holy See has taken to remove, even juridically, all doubt of the authenticity of said Brief. The precaution I referred to pleases me much: May God give it a prosperous and happy result.

The whole tenor of your letter goes to acquaint me of the state of Religion in the Apostolic Vicariate of Madras and Meliapore, in order that I may make known authentically my mind and judgment regarding it, as therefore a just cause exists in my opinion for me to give testimony as to my judgment on the subject in question, and as there is no room for hesitation, you will find the said testimony annexed to this letter. In the mean time I pray God to preserve your Lordship long, in good health and happiness.

I remain with due reverence

Your Lordship's most faithful and humble Brother in Christ.

+ CL. BONNAND,

Bishop of Drusipare.

Pondicherry, May, 20th, 1839.

The following is the testimony of his Lordship, above referred to, We Clement Bonnand, Bishop of Drusipare, and Vicar Apostolic on the Coromandel coast, and in the provinces of Madura, Marava, and Tanjore, make known to all and every person whom it may or shall concern, that We, having duly considered every thing to be considered, acknowledge the authenticity and authority of the Apostolic Brief ‘*Multa Præclare*,’ so far as relates to all the countries which the said Brief regards.

2d. That by virtue of this Brief We acknowledge the most Illustrious and most Revd. D. O'Connor D. D. Bishop of Salditan, as the only legitimate and canonically appointed Vicar Apostolic of Madras and Meliapore, notwithstanding the vain assertions which the Portuguese and India Portuguese make about the right of Patronage and the Concordats formerly entered into between the Kings of Portugal and the Popes; for the Kings of Portugal have for a long time ceased to fulfil the onerous conditions, to the observance of which the Right of Patronage was annexed, and by

such omission must be considered deservedly, to have renounced their right of Patronage, and the Sovereign Pontiff expressly derogated from that right of Patronage in the aforesaid Brief: and We acknowledge that all the care of the Church of Madras and Meliapore both in spiritual and temporal concerns can lawfully belong only to the aforesaid Most Illustrious & Most Reverend D. O'Connor. Thirdly; that we acknowledge, that all those Priests or Lay-persons, who resist his authority, or impede him in the administration of the spiritual and temporal concerns of the Churches entrusted to him, are guilty of rebellion against the Holy Apostolic See, and can be lawfully called Schismatics.

Given at Pondicherry under our Signature and Seal this 20th day of May, 1839.

+ Cl. B ONNAND.
Bishop of Drusipare V. A.

THE ANTIQUITY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH PROVED BY PROTESTANT TESTIMONY.

LETTER III.

To the Lord Bishop of Exeter.

MY LORD BISHOP,—The antiquity of the doctrine called Popery I prove in this letter from the most eminent Protestant writers. Bishop Tillotson (Sermon 49, p. 588) writes thus:—‘In the beginning of the Reformation, when Antichrist sat securely in the quiet possession of his kingdom, Luther arose,’ &c. These words, *securely, and in the quiet possession*, must be owned to be very emphatical, though I cannot draw any positive conclusion from them as to the number of years which that secure and quiet possession had already lasted; but, since so learned a man as the Bishop was could not be ignorant of it, it is probable he foresaw the advantage we should derive from it had he been too particular, and, therefore, judged it not safe to speak out, but chose rather to leave his reader in the dark than let him know more than was fitting for him. Perkins, in his ‘Exposition upon the Creed,’ page 400, ventures to be a little plainer. His words are these:—‘We say that before the days of Luther, for the space of many hundred years, an universal apostacy overspread the whole face of the earth and that our church was not then visible in the world.’ Here Popery, which the author is pleased to call an ‘universal apostacy,’ is owned to have overspread the whole face of the earth for many hundred years before the days of Luther. However, he did not think it proper to specify, as he might have done, how many hundred years this ‘universal apostacy,’ had already lasted; but every intelligent reader will be apt to guess, that when a man says many hundred years he does not mean a very small number. But the Protestant ‘Homily Book,’ my Lord Bishop, in order to set forth in the most pathetic manner the danger of Popery, which the composer has the charity to call ‘abominable idolatry,’—this book, I say, whose authenticity cannot be questioned, has ventured to explain some part of Perkin’s many hundred years. The words are as follow:—‘Laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages, sects, and degrees of men, women and children of all Christendom had been at once drowned in abominable idolatry, and that for the space of eight hundred years and more.’—(*Hom. against Peril of Idolatry*, part iii, page 251; printed in London, A.D. 1687.) Here then, my Lord Bishop, we have eight hundred years, with more at the end of them, allowed to Popery before the Reformation. The word ‘more’ may be made to signify as much or as little as every one pleases; but it may modestly be extended so far as to make the total number amount to about nine hundred years in all, which brings universal Popery to St. Gregory’s time, who transplanted it to England, where it flourished just nine hundred years before the Reformation; so that I have brought it safe to the beginning of

the seventh century, that is within a hundred and fifty years of the fourth general council, and now I have only this small interval of time to provide for it, which I can easily do with the help of a good Protestant guide; it will easily find its way to the very time of the apostles. But I have luckily met with one who even outsteps my wishes, and who has conducted Popery not only to the fourth but even beyond the first great general council of Nice. The person I allude to is Mr. Napier, who, in his 'Book on the Revelations,' prop. xxxvii., page 68, is so sincere as to own that Popery (to which he cannot forbear giving a very ugly name) reigned universally in the very beginning of the fourth century, and under the first Christian emperor that ever existed. But for fear any one should think Mr. Napier was an obscure or inconsiderable writer, Mr. Collier, in his 'Historical Dictionary,' has taken care to publish his merits, for he styles him 'a profound scholar, and of great worth.' This learned and most worthy person, then, writes thus:—'From the year of Christ three hundred and sixteen the Anti-Christian and Papistical reign began, reigning universally and without any debateable contradiction one thousand two hundred and sixty years.' And again, chap. xi. p. 145, 'The pope and clergy have possessed the outward visible church even one thousand two hundred and sixty years.' I presume he counts to the time that the Reformation was established in Great Britain. This, however, is precise and clear, though the other three gentlemen were more or less on the reserve. Tillotson has only favoured us with a broad hint. Perkins, indeed, allows Popery many hundred years and more, but is careful not to let us know how many. The Homilist gives it eight hundred years and more; but his 'more' is like a string that may be let out or drawn in as every one shall fancy. But the learned and worthy Napier speaks boldly, and may serve as a comment upon the other three; for we are assured by him that the Papistical reign began from the year of Christ three hundred and sixteen, that is precisely a year more than twelve hundred before Luther commenced Reformer. How much it is to be lamented that he has not specified the very day of the month on which Popery began its universal reign; for, when his hand was in, he might have done the one with as much ease as the other, and then Papists might have had the pleasure, my Lord Bishop, to keep the anniversary feast of its accession to the empire of the universal church. But, though Mr. Napier has done Popery a considerable service by allowing it an universal reign, even in the beginning of the fourth century; yet the four Protestant annalists, commonly called Magdeburgians, carry it still higher, and stick not to date their pretended decay of the Christian doctrine, and the straw and stubble of Papistical errors as they call them, even from the age immediately after Christ and his apostles. Thus God has confounded the enemies of his church by making them become witnesses of the truth against their will and proclaim the antiquity of her faith in those very writings which they intended for the sharpest invectives against it. Upon the whole I cannot but make this observation, viz.:—That, if Popery had its beginning in any age since the time of the apostles, it is morally impossible but so considerable an event must have been transmitted to posterity, I will not say by one or two historians of note but by hundreds, who would have marked out the time when it happened with such an unquestionable certainty that it would have been impossible either to doubt of it or differ in opinion about it. Thus we know exactly the very year when Arianism and Lutheranism began. The facts were never questioned by any man in the world, and the certainty of them leaves no room for any diversity of opinions about them. If, then, there were ancient records or authentic history that fixed precisely the time when Popery began, would not all Protestants have quoted them in proof of a fact which must have sunk the credit of the Church of Rome to all intents and purposes, and established the reformed churches upon the most solid foundation? It is quite certain that they never would have overlooked an advantage of such an importance; nay, every man of learning would have had

it by heart; and the date of every branch of Popery would have been as well known as that of the Reformation, concerning which there never were two opinions among thousands who have written on the subject. Since, therefore, instead of this unanimous agreement in fixing the time that Popery began, we find nothing but shuffling, precarious guesses, and diversity of opinions among the very best Protestant writers, it is a demonstrative proof that they have no authentic or ancient records concerning any beginning of it since the time of the apostles; and we may justly conclude, my Lord Bishop, that, as it reigned universally for many hundred years and more, according to the 'Book of Homilies'—for above twelve hundred years, according to Mr. Napier—and, as it is owned by the Magdeburgians to have had a being even in the second century, we may conclude, I say, that it never had any other beginning than that of Christianity, viz. from Christ himself and his apostles. I observe, secondly, that the old nonsensical whim of introducing Popery in the monkish ages (as Protestants stile them) of pretended ignorance and darkness is quite discarded by the Homilist and by Mr. Napier; for, in the beginning of the fourth century, there were no monks whatever, as all Protestants understood the word, and, though there were several monasteries of them in the beginning of the seventh century, yet what Protestants call monkish ages are of a much later date; and so the pretended ignorance and darkness of those ages could not favour the introduction of Popery, which, according to the 'Book of Homilies,' was fully established long before. But to return once more to the learned Mr. Napier, whose chronology relating to the grand epoch of Popery is very curious. We see that he fixes it precisely in the year of Christ 316, that is nine years before the first general council of Nice, which was held A. D. 325; nay, he tells us expressly, he tells us even then it reigned universally, so that it may be truly said, in Bishop Tillotson's language, that even then 'Antichrist sat securely in the quiet possession of his kingdom.' Now, my Lord Bishop, all this is very strange, unless we had some information how it got into it! For a kingdom of so vast an extent as the whole Christian world is not usually got like a purse by stealth. However that may be, it follows evidently, from Mr. Napier's chronology, that the fathers of the Nicene Council, though allowed and respected by Protestant themselves, were all staunch Papists, and, what is very remarkable, many of the bishops of that council were eminent saints, and carried about them the glorious marks of their past sufferings for the faith of Christ. I ask, then, whether the bishops of the Nicene Council had been Papists from their infancy or not? If so, then without all dispute they had been brought up by Papists, and so Popery is still more ancient than Mr. Napier makes it. But if they had not been Papists, then they were all infamous apostates, St. Athanasius among the rest. And is it not very strange that not one of them should be touched with remorse, nor represent to the council their fall from the ancient religion, nor exhort them to a reformation, especially when the supposed change from one religion to another was of so recent a date that there was not a bishop in the council but must have been concerned in it? But it is still more wonderful, my Lord Bishop, that the Arians, their mortal enemies, who were admitted to and heard in the council, should not reproach them with their apostacy, and so put them to open shame. And yet the acts and histories of that council mention no such thing; nay, Eusebius himself, who was present at it, and has written the history of the church down to his time, knew nothing of any universal apostacy from the primitive faith of the church to Popery; for, had he known it, it is not possible he would have passed it over in silence; and, therefore, my Lord Bishop, since neither he nor those who wrote immediately after him have left us any history, record, or monument of any change in the universal visible church introduced before their time, it is manifest there never was any such change: and, consequently, the Popery which Mr. Napier owns to have reigned universally even nine years before the council of Nice, was the very religion that had been handed down to them from the apostles themselves. But I shall now, my Lord Bishop, set aside these testimonies of Protestant

writers, which witness the antiquity of the Roman Catholic faith, and endeavour to take a more effectual way to prove it, without being obliged to the courtesy of any Protestant evidence to vouch for it. In order to avoid an unnecessary multiplicity of words, as all the pretended errors of the church of Rome are briefly expressed by the word Popery, so the doctrine of the Reformation, as it is directly opposite to it, for brevity sake I shall call Protestancy, because I shall have occasion to repeat them both frequently; and it is of no consequence what names we give them so we but understand one another. Now the whole question is, whether the doctrine called Protestancy or that which is called Popery has a fairer title to antiquity? If Protestancy be the true Christian doctrine which was taught by the apostles, it must have had a being in the world pre-existing to that of Popery; and then there must have happened a total change from Protestancy to Popery in some age or other since the time of the apostles, for without this change Popery could not have got possession of the universal visible church, as it certainly had at the beginning of the Reformation, when the courageous Martin Luther stood alone against the whole Christian world. It shall therefore be my task to demonstrate that there never happened any such change, or, which amounts to the same, that no church, teaching a doctrine opposite to the pretended errors of the church of Rome, ever appeared in the world before her, which, if it be made evident, the consequence will be, that the doctrine called Popery is as ancient as Christianity itself, and has been handed down to us from Christ and his apostles. But I must here observe, my Lord Bishop, that Popery in general may be divided into two parts, viz. the discipline and the faith of the church of Rome. The proper object of faith are all revealed truths, which are the same in all ages, nor can any authority upon earth pretend to make the least change in them; but the discipline of the church, not being of Divine revelation but human institution, is doubtless changeable, because the same legislative power, whether in church or in state, which can make laws and regulations for the public good, may likewise for just reasons alter, suspend, or repeal the laws or regulations it has made. Thus the ancient penitential canons, though they were in force for some ages, have not been binding for many hundred years past. Thus, likewise, the council of Trent regulated the prohibited degrees of consanguinity and affinity otherwise than they were before. Nay, even the apostolical institution of the council of Jerusalem, which forbids blood and things strangled (*Acts*, xv. 29), remained not long in force; but, as the motive ceased, the obligation consequently became void; for let laws be ever so good in themselves, they are not good at all times nor in all places. Now then, when I pretend to prove that the doctrine called Popery is as ancient as Christianity, I mean not the discipline but the faith of the church of Rome; for it is absurd to maintain that regulations of discipline, which came gradually into the church and have been subject to variations, are as ancient as the church itself. It is, however, a very common practice, though a very unfair one, among Protestant writers, when they intend to charge the church of Rome with novelty, to confound the one with the other, and exemplify promiscuously in points of faith or discipline as if they were on the same footing; whereas, to bring any thing home against the church, they must prove precisely that she differs in some article of faith or revealed doctrine from the ancient orthodox church. All matters of discipline must therefore be put out of the question, and whatever objection is made upon that head is trifling, whether the facts objected to be true or false.

I am,
My Lord Bishop,
Your obedient Servant,

VERAX,

A Catholic Layman.

London, April 14, 1838.

CURIOSITIES OF LITERATURE AT THE REFORMATION.

No. III.

DESTRUCTION OF THE MSS.

In a preceding number we have shown what labour was undergone, and what expense was incurred by the monks, in transcribing, illuminating, and binding manuscripts. Our present number will show how soon the work of centuries was devoted to destruction by Protestant avarice and fanaticism. To describe England as it was before the pestilential breath of Protestantism had swept over the land, blasting its fairest fruits, and corrupting its living waters, would be an endless yet a pleasing task. Of all the countless blessings of Catholicism,—and they were without number numberless,—the husk, the shell, the mere outside only now remains : Protestantism has long since torn the fruit from its parent stem. Our Catholic families have been degraded, our monasteries have been sacked, and our cathedrals have been gutted ; yet, emblems of the faith that raised them, they still point their towering heads to heaven. Like mountain fastnesses, they still uprear their strong bulwarks to guard the land from utter profanation ; like vigilant sentinels, they still watch over the country to preserve it till the return of the ages of faith. But, leaving the ruins of fallen monasteries and desolated mansions to tell their own tales, we hasten to unfold the workings of the new faith in religious processes removed from the eyes of the great bulk of mankind.

Our libraries are, comparatively, of recent formation ; for the pseudo reformers did not spare even those which they found in their universities. Goaded on by their insatiable avarice, they spared not the most costly, the most valuable manuscripts. For them the philosophy of Cicero, the thundering eloquence of Demosthenes, and the preaching of Paul, had not half the enticements as the gold and silver, the rubies and sapphires, that adorned their covers. It is true they would not, like the monks, have effaced a *De Republica* of Cicero to transcribe in its place a commentary of St. Augustine ; their's was not the work of transcription, but of plunder. Willingly would they have let the most rapid homily occupy its place in the library, if it had no allurements to their avarice, while the works of Tacitus or Cicero, however splendidly written, would have been ruthlessly consigned to the flames, to enable them to get at the gold and silver, with which their backs were inlaid. 'Never,' says the graphic historian of the Reformation, 'in all probability, since the world began, was there so rich a harvest of plunder. The ruffians of Cromwell entered the convents ; they tore down the altars to get away the gold and silver ; ransacked the chests and drawers of the monks and nuns ; tore off the covers of books that were ornamented with the precious metals. These books were all in manuscript. Single books had taken, in many cases, half a long lifetime to compose and to copy out fair. Whole libraries, the getting of which together had taken ages upon ages, and had cost immense sums of money, were scattered abroad by these hellish ruffians, when they had robbed the covers of their rich ornaments.'

At the time of the suppression the libraries of England were stored with many rich and valuable manuscripts. From a supplication of Dr. Dee, addressed to Queen Mary, we learn that Cicero's much regretted work, *De Republica*, formerly existed in the library of Canterbury. It is asserted, that no other kingdom of equal size contained so many manuscripts ; but, at the sale of the abbeys, they were destroyed and wasted. We are amply borne out in these assertions by the lamentation and complaint of John Bale to King Edward VI., in 1549. He wrote at the time this destruction was going on ; he was on the spot at the time, and therefore knew these things as well we know the facts which are passing before our eyes. 'A number of those persons,' he observes, 'who bought the monasteries, reserved of the library books

thereof, some to serve their jokes; some to scour their candlesticks, and some to rub their boots; some they sold to the grocers, and soap-sellers, and some they sent over sea to the bookbinders, not in small numbers, but, at times, whole ships full. Even the universities of this realm were not all clear in this detestable fact. I know a merchantman that bought the contents of two noble libraries for forty shillings price. The stuff thereof he hath occupied instead of gray paper, by the space of more than these ten years; and yet he hath store enough for as many years to come. Our posterity may well curse this wicked fact of our age, this unreasonable spoil of England's most noble antiquities.'

'I have heard,' observes Robert Lambe, Vicar of Norham-upon-Tweed, 'that the fine collection of manuscripts, belonging to the cathedral church of Durham, was saved by being concealed within one of the pillars of the church.' But though saved from the ruffians of Cromwell and the minions of a tyrant king, they have not escaped the avarice and bigotry of succeeding speculators. The *Liber Vitæ*, already mentioned as having been placed on the high altar of Durham cathedral, which was *richly covered with gold and silver*, is now preserved in the British Museum, but it has *lost its splendid binding*. Dr. Dobson's nurse, between the years 1695 and 1718, is said to have gone into the library, during wet weather, and to have cut out the splendid illuminations to amuse the children under her care. The vulgate given by Bishop Pudsey, and other volumes, brilliantly illuminated, have been shamefully despoiled of their illuminations.

With examples of such wholesale destruction before us, it would be idle to mention other individual cases. But it is really astonishing that, with such facts staring them in the face, writers should still be found brazen enough to declare that Protestantism has ever been the patron of learning, and that Catholicism has been hostile to it. Catholic writers have been so timid, and Protestant writers have been so bold, that these lies have been hitherto put forth without fear of contradiction. Every vapouring lad that has got half an education at Oxford or Cambridge, thinks himself entitled to prate in some Magazine or Review about the mental bondage of Popery, and its attempts to keep the world in ignorance. Even if such statements were true, it little becomes Protestants, with such Vandal acts staring them in the face, to rate others; the *pot* ought to be careful not to call the *kettle* ugly names. All you who revel in the perusal of the classics,—who dream of battles and sieges with Homer; of rural scenery and pastoral delights with Theocritus; of husbandry and the woes of Troy with Virgil; of love with Anacreon; of crime with Horace; of oratory and philosophy with Cicero; of the craft of Philip, and the supineness of Athens with Demosthenes,—all you who travel through ancient realms and delight in marvels with Herodotus, or soar on eagle's wings with Pindar, arise, do justice to the calumniated ages of faith. When writers—be they diffusers of useful or Christian knowledge—unblushingly publish these slanders, tear the mask from their hypocritical face, and expose the hideous deformity of their own system.

SAGITTARIUS.

Mount Pleasant.

FALKIRK.—A new station has lately been formed there, by the Rev. Paul MacLachlan, of Stirling, for the benefit of the men employed on the Edinburgh and Glasgow railway. Besides these, however, there is a considerable number of Catholics in, and near to, Falkirk; so that, in the course of some time, it will be necessary to erect a chapel there. On the 28th of April last, Mr. MacLachlan said Mass in a hall there, (the first Mass, indeed, said in it since the Reformation): the number of persons who assisted at it was 182, all Catholics, with the exception of five strangers: about twenty more Catholics could not, after coming from a distance, hear Divine Service; the hall, in which it was performed, being, ere they arrived, filled in every part.—*Catholic Magazine for June.*

FLOWERS FROM THE HOLY FATHERS,
No. XIV.

'Vigilantia opus est; nam et miles, non in lecto dormit, sed humi; piscator, non dormiens piscatur, sed stans; aliquando peragit noctem, agricola omnem adhibet vigilantiam, ne agros, segeti, vel vineæ damnum aliquod inseratur. Pastor sub dio vigilans custodit gregem, sicut Jacob dicebat, noctu diuque æstu urgebar et gelu, fugiebatque somnus ab oculis meis.'—*Sti. Johan. Chrysostomi, Hom. 22. Ad Pop.*

HERE we must watch and weep and pray.

If we would follow virtue's way :

Attacks without, assaults within,

By day and night urge on to sin,

Constant allurements meet our view,

Assume fresh shapes and aspects new,—

In seeming garb of virtue drest

Walk forth the spirits of unrest.

The soldier in the battle field

Who watches not, is sure to yield—

The sailor sleepless walks the deck

To save the ship from foe and wreck—

The husbandman goes round his farm

To guard his crops from waste or harm,

The shepherd watches in his pen

Lest the gaunt wolf should leave his den.

And, Christian soul, hast thou no fear,

But wilt thou rest in quiet here—

Wilt thou neglect the saving Cross,

When thine may be an endless loss—

Wilt thou forget to watch and weep—

Rest on in dull and troublous sleep—

When thou may'st wake one dismal morn,

Too late by penance to return ?

Oh, by the foes that round thy bed

Nightly keep watch with unclean tread !

Oh, by the non-day fiends that stroll

In ardent hope to catch thy soul,

By all temptations' rabble-rout,

Within, around, above, without—

Oh ! ere it be too late, awake,

And slumber from thine eye-lids shake.

Oh ! by the sweat of blood that dewed

Thy blessed Lord in capious flood,

Let not thy feeble flesh prevail—

Sleep not—when wicked thoughts assail,

Rise from thy bed, rise up and pray—

Watch ye by night—watch on by day,

Till final perseverance bring

Sweet rest for watchful suffering !

Printed by Messrs. W. Buxton and Co., Calcutta, for the Proprietors,
price one rupee per month, or ten rupees per annum in advance. To new
subscribers 8 annas per number.

THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

'One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.'

NO. XXII.

NOVEMBER 30, 1839.

VOL. I.

TRADITION ESTABLISHED BY NATURE AS THE SAFE AND PROPER CHANNEL OF KNOWLEDGE BOTH HUMAN AND DIVINE.

It is by Tradition that languages living and dead ; arts, sciences, professions and trades ; the curious and singular operations adopted in mechanics and agriculture ; the laws of kingdoms and the annals of history ; the opinions of philosophers, the sayings of the wise, and the rules, manners, and customs of society, are communicated and preserved amongst mankind. There is nothing which we know ; nothing which exalts and expands our faculties ; nothing, in a word, which raises us above the brute creation that is not imparted to us through the means of Tradition. It is through this channel alone, that knowledge from her ample store pours at our feet her intellectual treasures, enriching the present age with the gathered spoils of all those that are past, and advancing it to that high degree of cultivation, which we so much boast of and admire. If this channel of knowledge were dried up, it is certain that in a few years we should be no better than the savages of the forest. Nay ! we should be far inferior to them ; for amongst them Tradition exists, slender and scanty indeed, but yet sufficient to unfold and develop their reasoning faculty (man's distinguishing perfection), and to call forth into action the pre-eminent excellence which nature gave them in the scale of being upon earth. If Tradition, therefore, is not only a faithful, but the only channel of all human knowledge, it is obvious that it may be the faithful channel of divine. For as language, in which human truths are clothed, is handed down and preserved with an astonishing fidelity, so language, which embodies and invests the revealed truths of God, will live on the lips, and in the hearts of men, with equal vigour and constancy. The words which express the mysteries of religion, may be taught and learnt with the same facility, and at the same time, as those which convey to the mind the truths of philosophy. Thus nature which adopts Tradition as her only channel, offers it to religion ; and God,—who the author of both, knows how to combine them in

harmony, who is as simple as he is grand in his works—rejects every instrument which is unnecessary in the execution of his designs.

The fitness of Tradition as the channel of religion is still further enforced by the fact, that man, in his childhood, is obliged by nature herself to trust and rely on it alone. Does not the child implicitly believe every thing which its parents teach it? Is it not nature which bids it unhesitatingly confide in the dear authors of its life and being? Thus, in sucking the milk, it imbibes the creed of its mother, and each day, as it grows and strengthens, it discovers in its mind, as well as in its body, fresher and more distinct lines of resemblance to its parent. From its mother's lips it inhales at the same time the first elements of human and divine knowledge, and learns, whilst it tries to stammer forth the names of visible things, to lisp the tender name of Jesus. It first learns what is or is not. Every truth, whether it regard this world or the next, is engraven on the memory, ere the reasons which establish it, are known to the understanding; and as the child is convinced of the truth of mathematics before it begins to study them, so the faith of the parent becomes the faith of the child, long before its mind is sufficiently matured to examine and judge the grounds of its belief. Thus each one in his infancy is so placed by nature, that he cannot but receive the religion of those, whose office it is to sow in his tender mind the seeds of thought, and to teach them how to shoot. Religion, whether true or false, which is thus early planted in the mind of the child, grows with his growth and strengthens with his strength, intertwining itself round his heart, and working itself into his affections in such manner, that to sever it at length from his sympathies, to which each year it clings with firmer hold, costs a pang as violent as that which is felt in the soul's separation from the body. In every system of religion existing in the world, we observe this striking fact; which would not be universal if it were not the work of nature; who, endearing to the child the religion which she obliges it to receive by Tradition from its parents, declares that her Great Master established Tradition as the channel, not only of all human, but of divine knowledge.

Who is there that has not remarked the readiness with which men receive, and the tenacity with which they hold, the religious doctrines taught them by their parents. Whether we survey the present existing nations of the earth, or look back at past ages through the medium of history,—everywhere the same striking feature presents itself in the character of man. The Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans; the Hindoos, and Chinese; the Turks, and the sects of Christianity, which have lived from the 6th or the 15th century, bear witness to the truth of the assertion. Mistrustful as it were of his own tottering footsteps, each one on the rough road to another world is anxious to recline on him who walks before, and thinks no path more safe than that which has been long trodden by his forefathers. This feeling is so strongly ingrafted in our nature, that it not only determines the unlettered,—who in religion are incapable of judging rightly for themselves, and are obliged to trust to the teaching of others,—but exerts a powerful influence over the minds of the learned and wise. When religion has thus been once planted in the heart, we observe everywhere how difficult it is to uproot it, whether true or false. Hence arises the main difficulty in conversion; hence appears how splendid a miracle was the quick propagation of Christianity through the Pagan world. For men are ever extremely ingenious to discover reasons to cling to what has long

grown and fastened on their affections, and they part with it, when it is torn from them after many struggles, and with the utmost reluctance. If the religion be false, this fond prejudice is fostered by the corrupt passions of the heart, which strongly determine the judgment ; if it be true, this attachment to the faith which has been imbibed, is confirmed by the grace of God, and the bright rays of truth that flash conviction on the mind. There is therefore a principle in man which prompts him, not only to follow the religion of his parents, but to adhere to it with firmness and constancy. Is it not evident that an All-wise Being can avail himself of this religious adhesiveness which he himself has planted in us, and having once set men in the right path, continue their descendants in it by means of the gentle operation of this natural principle ?

The believing of religious tenets, taught and handed down by our forefathers, is so conformable to the constitution of our nature, that Protestant sects not only act upon Tradition, but are obliged to do so, though for the most part they pretend to reject it from their system of faith. Why do members of the Anglican Church, the Methodists, the Baptists, the Presbyterians, the Unitarians, the Independents, or the Quakers profess generally the creeds which their respective names designate ? Because each one, unaided by another, found his creed in the Bible ? No ! He professed the creed, which he believes, before he had read the Bible. Because the Lord inspired it ? Then all the Protestant sectarians are inspired and infallible, though they believe contradictory doctrines which the Lord cannot inspire ! Why then is a Baptist, or a Methodist, or a Quaker, what he calls himself ? For this reason,—that he learnt and believed it on tradition from his parents, or from preachers whom he had heard deliver the doctrine. If this were not so, then the son of a Quaker, placed from his earliest infancy under the sole tuition of the Baptists, would turn out a Quaker, though he had never seen or heard of the religious principles of the Quakers. Naturalists inform us that birds, taken away early from their parents, will build their nests exactly like those of their kind, without having ever seen a model. But in human beings there is no such instinct, which directs them to build their creeds ; nor do the Baptists suppose it to exist : otherwise they would not be so eager to take charge of INFANT SCHOOLS, where infants of other religionists are educated ; nor would they, by preaching and writing, labour so vigorously to force their principles on mankind. They may profess what they please ; but their conduct, more intelligible than their words, evidently shows, that to spread their doctrines, they trust no more to inspiration than to instinct, but use, for the purpose, the sole channel which nature points out as proper to transmit and propagate religion amongst reasonable beings.

Though so wide a range in the choice of religion is allowed to the various Protestant sects by the loose principle of PRIVATE JUDGMENT, yet so strong is man's propensity to believe the doctrines taught him by his forefathers, so firm his tenacity of what he learnt in his youth, so great the natural force and fidelity of tradition, that in despite of their leading maxim, which tends to disunite and dissolve them, each sect, with variations it is true, has kept itself for nearly three hundred years in existence, and preserved somewhat of its original character and form. For to what other cause but to tradition can be ascribed the continuance of Lutheranism in Germany, Calvinism in Geneva, Anglican Episcopacy in England, Presbyterianism in Scotland, or Quakerism in Pennsylvania ?

Each sect preserves itself in the place where it was established. Is it not evident that each still exists because its system of belief has been handed down from father to son, through the space of three centuries? How strongly grafted in our nature then must it be to use tradition as the vehicle of religion, when Protestantism which, from its maxim of private judgment, tends, like water, to the separation of its parts, has been so long kept together in the respective channels wherein it first began to flow, though in theory it pretends to deny the use and service of tradition. It was tradition, which in early youth imparted to each sectarian the doctrines of his father's creed; tradition, which taught him that the Bible is the word of God; tradition, which pointed out the passages seeming to favour his particular notions of religion; tradition which showed the isolated sentences to be adduced against the Catholic Church, and taught the forced method of explaining them; tradition, which transmitted to him the false statements and monstrous calumnies, invented by the first reformers, and sedulously preserved to the present time. This is so manifest, so evident, that no one but a wild, unlettered fanatic will venture to deny it. Wherefore to ground belief on authority, to follow the religion taught by the parent, to adhere to it with tenacious fidelity—in a word, to use tradition as the channel of knowledge whether human or divine, is a principle dictated by nature, approved of by reason, enforced by the constitution of our being, and confirmed by universal experience.

PROPAGATION OF THE FAITH.

On Sunday last, we had the gratification of being present at the Principal Catholic Church when the REVEREND DR. OLIFFE announced from the Pulpit the Institution of the 'Propagation of the Faith.' We are unable to do any thing like justice to the short but eloquent address, with which the Reverend Gentleman introduced the subject, but we believe that the following brief sketch of it will be found tolerably correct:

'It has devolved on me this morning, in lieu of the usual discourse, to publish to you, Beloved brethren, an address, which was originally composed for your fellow-subjects and fellow-Catholics in Great Britain. It is calculated to introduce into this country, a branch of that great institution, entitled 'La Propagation de la Foi,' which, as you will afterwards perceive, has conferred invaluable benefit on the cause of religion throughout an immense portion of the globe. With very few alterations the address may be adapted to your local circumstances, and there are several motives, why you should enrol yourselves under the banners of the Branch Society in England. I shall state them briefly, and will leave it to you to consider them more profoundly.—The first is a fellow-feeling which you should entertain for all that is good and virtuous, in common with those, of whom you boast to be fellow-subjects. The second is, a unanimity in religious opinions, on reflecting that as you glory to profess a faith, which is now making such rapid progress among the most enlightened members of that illustrious nation, so you should not hesitate to join hand and heart with them in the diffusion of that religion far and wide throughout the earth. The third is, the peculiar state of religion in this country, proceeding from the comparatively limited number of Catholics, contrasted

with numberless multitudes of your fellow-creatures, who are still buried in the superstitions of Paganism, and walk benighted in the valley of idolatry. But the fourth and last is the most powerful of all, and even though the others were wanting, should be alone sufficient to animate you, in embracing so holy a cause. I allude to your quality of Christians. You profess to follow HIM, who descended from the bosom of the Eternal, to establish the religion that you are now called upon to support, and who, for the accomplishment of so noble an end, did not hesitate to spill the last drop of his priceless blood, and conscious of this, firmly believing it, will you shrink at the idea of disbursing a paltry sum [a half-anna per week] for the same sublime object? Oh! surely such conduct would be disgraceful to any community bearing the glorious name of CATHOLIC, a name, which would be a senseless sound, did it not effect that *universality*, which is expressed by its import.'

The Reverend Preacher then read the address of the Branch Council for Great Britain, the Members of which are :

PATRON,

The Rt. Rev. Dr. WALSH.

PRESIDENT,

The Right Hon. the EARL of SHREWSBURY.

VICE-PRESIDENTS,

The Rt. Hon. the Lord STOURTON.
The Rt. Hon. the Lord CLIFFORD.
The Hon. Sir EDW. VAVASOUR, Bart.
The Very Rev. Monsignore ACTON.
The Very Rev. Monsignore WISEMAN.
The Rev. RANDALL LYTHGOE, S. J.
The Rev. FRANCIS TRAPPES, Lee House.
The Rev. THOMAS HEPTONSTALL, O. S. B.
A. H. LYNCH, Esq., M. P.
JOSEPH WELD, Esq., Lulworth.
PHILIP JONES, Esq., Llanarth.
FRANCIS RIDDELL, Esq., Cheeseburn Grange.
JOHN SELBY, Esq., London.
FRANCIS MACDONNELL, Esq., Lincoln's Inn.
Dr. EDW. CHARLTON, Hesleyside.

JOHN VAUGHAN, Esq., Courtfield.
KENELM H. DIGBY, Esq., Paris.
MAJOR HUDDLESTONE, Sawston.
JOHN WELD, Esq., Leagram.
AMBROSE LISLE PHILLIPPS, Esq., Grace Dieu Manor.
J. LEONARD KEASLEY, Esq., London.
HENRY BARNEWALL, Esq., London.
LEWIS PEREIRA, Esq., (Macao.)
C. J. PAGLIANO, Esq., London.
THOS. KEASLEY, Esq., London.
JAS. YOUNES, Esq., London.
SCOTLAND.
JOHN MENZIES, Esq., Pitfodels.
MARMADUKE MAXWELL, Esq., Terregles.
Lieut. Col. MACDONELL, Edinburgh.
FRED. SCOTT, Esq., Edinburgh.

TREASURER,

HENRY ROBINSON, Esq.

SECRETARIES in London,

T. C. ANSTEY, Esq., 28, Southampton Buildings.
H. R. BAGSHAW, Esq., 2, New Square, Lincoln's Inn.
JOHN GRADY, Esq., 4, Union Place, Lambeth.
C. WELD, Esq., 6, Pump Court, Temple.

SECRETARY in the Country.

J. HARDMAN, Esq., Paradise Street, Birmingham.

BANKERS,

Messrs. WRIGHT & CO.

ADDRESS TO THE CATHOLICS OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Feast of St. Peter's Chair at Antioch, 1839.

THE Œuvre de la Propagation de la Foi, originally established at Lyons, with the purpose of collecting by small weekly subscriptions, funds for the support of Foreign Missions, has, by recent statutes, under the seal of the Council of Paris, and bearing date, October 1838, and January 1839, charged us, the council above-named, with the task of introducing their organization to the notice of the Catholic public in this country.

Our labour is the lighter, and our hopes of success are the more sanguine, because we are well aware that to many of those whom we have the honour to address, the objects of the Parent Society are already known; and that there are not a few persons in this country whose charity has already extended itself to these objects by private collections. We feel, therefore, that we are not so much soliciting their patronage for a new and strange charitable institution, as suggesting a long-expected scheme for giving a palpable form and efficiency to an existing prepossession in its favour.

At the same time, there are many who do not know even of the existence of such a society; many who know that it exists, but know nothing beyond its name; and many who are sensible that its objects are most meritorious, but have looked in vain for facilities to forward them. Among all these we shall confidently look for valuable and cordial co-operation, and, for their information, we beg to lay before them the following statement.

On the 3rd of May 1822, some pious laymen formed a society at Lyons, having for its object to assist, by prayers and alms, the Catholic missionaries charged to preach the Gospel to foreign nations.

The bond of union among the members was simply to recite a very short prayer every day, and to give a weekly subscription of one 'sou' towards the support of the missions.

The importance of the benefits (no less than Christianity and civilization)—which at so small a cost to individuals were to be conferred upon so large a portion of mankind; the strenuous efforts made by various sectaries in these countries to disseminate their respective creeds; the continually increasing demand for new missionaries of the True Faith; the urgent necessities of those who already laboured there; the pecuniary embarrassments of the Roman College 'De Propaganda Fide,' on whose support these missions chiefly depended; and the cordial and grateful approbation of sovereign Pontiffs frequently expressed,—all operated to swell the numbers of the young society.

It has now risen into maturity and strength. 'The grain of mustard seed' has grown into a great tree, and overshadowed nations with its branches. Having extended itself over the whole of France, the society has quickly spread through Belgium, Holland, Portugal, Switzerland, Savoy, Piedmont, Italy, Germany, Russia, and the Levant; and Great Britain remains almost the only country in Europe whose Catholic subjects have not enrolled themselves among its affiliated members. Within the last twelve months the Sister Isle, still as ready as she has always been, whether to glorify the cause of religion by her sufferings, or to support it by her charities, has set us an example, by forming a branch society of this great association, with all her prelates at the head of it.

The Parent Society had not long existed before it began to put forth, for the use of its members, its periodical annals. They contain accounts of its receipts, and of their application; with many interesting communications made to the council by the various missionaries; and other documents relating to its affairs. These annals, which appear six times a year, have now reached the sixty-second number, and form a sequel to the interesting and well-known 'Lettres édifiantes.' Editions have been circulated in the French, German, Italian, and Flemish languages; and, since it has been in contemplation to establish a branch of the society in this country, an English

edition has been published, the first number of which is dated January 1838. The existence of an edition in the language which now prevails in so many parts of the world, and the additional facilities thus afforded for circulating this interesting information cannot fail to be advantageous to the cause of religion in general; while it furnishes an additional inducement to support the society from which the publication emanates.

The Œuvre de la Propagation de la Foi had, previously to May 1838, collected upwards of £200,000, which it had distributed among nearly eighty missions in distant countries.*

The peculiar obligations of Great Britain and her colonies to this Society will be readily estimated, when we inform our brethren that out of nearly £40,000, received in the year ending May 1838, Great Britain supplied less than £100, while she received in her colonies nearly £2,000 from the funds of the Society. We will specify three examples of this liberality:—

	FR.	C.
To Dr. Fleming, V.A. of Newfoundland and Labrador	9,672	40
To Dr. M'Donald, V.A. of the English Antillas	10,500	—
To Dr. Polding, V.A. of Australasia	15,000	—

being upwards of £1,400 to these three alone.

Such generous efforts of zeal for that religion which knows no distinction of nations, and seeks no return from human gratitude, will not, the Council are confident, fail of their due effect on the noble minds to which they are now pleading. Britons as we are, we cannot be indifferent to the necessities of our own countrymen, when they are reduced to such extremity as to have moved the pity, and called forth the tender charities of the stranger. The emigrant appeals to us from the bleak wolds of the north; the colonist solicits help from the infectious west and the persecuting east; the convict implores our mercy from the horrors of his penal settlement in the south.

Catholics as we are, shall we do nothing to promote the universality of the faith we boast of among those nations that still sit in darkness? Our Protestant fellow-countrymen subscribe their annual millions, to furnish forth their hosts of missionaries; the poor man brings his mite, and the rich man showers down his gold, and for what? Alas! when the result of so much munificence is frequently to render the labours of future missionaries only the more difficult, and at best only to circulate opinions of Christianity which we cannot but deem erroneous, shall we think our weekly halfpence too expensive

* MISSIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN ASSISTED OUT OF THE FUNDS OF THE SOCIETY:—

<i>Europe.</i>	<i>The Holy Land,</i>	<i>Yu-nan,</i>	<i>Richmond,</i>
Zante,	Ancyra,	Su-Tchuen,	Charleston,
Santorini,	Nabeek,	Non-Quang,	Bardstown,
Naxia,	Mardin,	Nan-King,	Vincennes,
Syra,	Babylon,	Fo-Kien,	Cincinnati,
Tyno,	Salmas (Persia),	Corea,	St. Louis,
Salonica,	Thibet,	Mongalia,	New Orleans,
Bulgaria,	Hindustan,	East-India Islds.	Mobile,
Philippopoli,	Verapoli,		Carribee Islands,
Constantinople.	Cochin,		British Guiana,
	Madura,	<i>America.</i>	Dutch Guiana.
	Madras,	Hudson's Bay,	West-India Islds.
	Ava,	Newfoundland,	
<i>Asia.</i>	Pegu,	Labrador,	
Bursa,	Siam,	Nova Scotia,	<i>Africa.</i>
Scio,	Queda,	Halifax,	Algiers,
Smyrna,	Cochin China,	Upper Canada,	Tunis,
Alleppo,	Cambaja,	Dubuque,	Tripoli, in Barbary,
Damascus,	Laos,	Détroit,	Copts of Egypt,
Tripoli,	Ton-King,	Boston,	Cape of Good Hope.
Scorto, and } Eden, } Antoura,	Macao,	New York,	
Moumt Libanus,	Kiang-si,	Philadelphia,	
	Koui-Tcheou,	Baltimore,	<i>Australasia.</i>

an antidote to so great a misfortune? Besides, there are, several countries where Catholic missionaries alone have succeeded in obtaining a footing, and shall these be left destitute?

If it be whispered, that the admitted wants of religion in this country must first be satisfied, we point to the daily proofs of our regeneration, and reply that the day of depression is past—that it is time to forget our weakness,—to rise up and nerve our disenthralled limbs with new vigour, and to take our proper station among the Catholics of the world. Let us remember, that every bond of union which links the Catholic of Britain to his brethren in Christ, strengthens the religious spirit of each: that the proudest characteristic of our Church is her universality, and that her charity and communion of saints are essentially commensurate with the universe. She does not require that the objects of her sympathy should be present; her reward is neither in the applause nor the gratitude of man; and the benefits conferred on the poor stranger, and the distant savage, will as surely be acceptable to the Father of Mercies, and be entitled to their reward, as the relief bestowed on the more conspicuous necessities of our brethren in Great Britain.

It is certain, moreover, that charity is a virtue with which men become more enamoured, the more they are familiarised with its charms. In the countries where this Institution has extended itself, particularly in France, where its members are most numerous, other charities have kept pace with its progress, and flourished more luxuriantly than they did before: and, in Britain, as elsewhere, it will be found that no charitable fund will be diminished, because its subscribers have added one halfpenny to their weekly expenditure. Is it credible, that charity has reached so high a level in this country, that every attainable halfpenny of the Catholic's income is absorbed already, and that, for so glorious and praiseworthy an object, he cannot part with one more? The Council place more reliance on the generosity of their countrymen than to give ear to such suggestions, when the temporal and spiritual necessities of hundreds of zealous missionaries, and tens of thousands of precious souls, are needing their assistance.

We do not wish to interfere with any prior or more immediate claim. If any poor brother have but one mite to give, and hesitates whether that one shall be bestowed upon the interests of religion abroad, or upon those which surround him at home, we cheerfully withdraw our claim for it, and only ask him to assist us by those prayers for our success which the poorest can best afford.

But, while we disclaim all rivalry, and ask no undue preference for those purposes of charity which we have in view, we should gain but little countenance from the spirit of British independence, did we not boldly declare our own. In the emphatic words of the Council of Paris, the constitutions of the Society, 'to whose unity, uniformity, and universality its success is owing, necessarily imply the exclusion of all coalition between the *Œuvre de la Propagation de la Foi* and any other work, however respectable it may otherwise be, either in its objects or in the persons who support it.' It does not depend upon us to alter these constitutions. All attempts to modify or adapt them to the ideas of the different nations which have received this institution, have uniformly been rejected. We present them to our Catholic countrymen in their purity and integrity; and, if it should seem that they have not intrinsic worth sufficient to recommend them, let us now add a stronger recommendation than any words of ours can give.

In the 58th Number of the *Annals*, May 1838, the Councils of Lyons and Paris thus address the subscribers: 'It would be idle in us to attempt to add anything to such numerous and pressing recommendations; [the pastorals of the French hierarchy.] What effect could our words produce, after what has been said by those to whom it has been given to govern the Church of God? Still, in order to crown this splendid mass of exhortation and penegyric with a fitting conclusion, we will confine ourselves simply to recalling the words of the Supreme Head of the Church, repeating what he was pleased lately to

communicate to a holy Bishop, and many other persons, with an express injunction to convey the intelligence to us :—‘ That this Society, for the propagation of the Faith, is, in the midst of the afflictions that oppress him, *the consolation reserved to his heart : that its successes are his joy, and that he counts on the members of this Association for the support of the missions.*’

Other testimonies of His Holiness's approbation have since been given. The precious relics of St. Exuperus, lately discovered in the Roman Catacombs, have been sent, adorned in the richest manner, to the church of the Council at Lyons, to remain there ‘ as a public and solemn pledge of His Holiness's good-will and gratitude for the services rendered to Catholicity by this Association.’ (Annals, No. LXI.) We have also been informed of various expressions of his continued approbation, and of the gratification with which he looks forward to the success of this Institution in Great Britain. Not only has he praised its organization, he has even paid it the high compliment of suggesting it as a model for other societies. To ensure its welfare, and to protect it from errors and difficulties, he has especially recommended it, by a direct appeal to their General, to the care of that illustrious Society which had the honour to send forth the great Jesuit missionary, the patron of the Œuvre, the glorious St. Francis Xavier.

Nor do we lack powerful sanction at home ; we are proud to appear before the Catholic world under the patronage of that eminent prelate, whose firm but gentle zeal has conciliated so many to the cause of true religion ; and we feel sure, that the name of one so distinguished as he has been for pouring the oil of charity on all around, without ever fearing that the cruse would fail, will prove the best apology we can have for asking others to follow his example.

We have now laid before the Catholic public of Great Britain a short summary of the history, objects, organisation, and recommendations, of the society which we represent, and of which we invite them to become members. In the few weeks of the last summer, during which the zealous treasurer of the Paris council was in this country, he received in aid of its funds a sum nearly equal to what was subscribed by the whole of France in the first year of its establishment there ; and our receipts for the year 1838, though no public appeal was made, nor any extensive scale of proceedings has been adopted, will be £640.

After so auspicious a commencement, our ultimate success ceases to be questionable.

Founded by the laity, and chiefly depending on them for support, the society has almost uniformly, in its early stages, been regarded by the bishops and clergy with a jealous eye, and has met with comparatively few supporters among them ; until its character has become developed, and increasing zeal and charity *at home*, have marked the progress of its successful exertions in aid of foreign missions. Thus, even the saintly Archbishop of Paris for several years hesitated to countenance it ; he has now long since proclaimed himself one of its most munificent patrons ; and so rapidly has it removed suspicion and won esteem, as to have become an object for frequent and emphatic eulogium in the pastoral letters of nearly every bishop in France.

In Great Britain we do not fear that the infant society will have to struggle against any such oppositions. The experience of other countries will have quieted suspicion ; the necessities of our own missions at home, and the memory of greater distress recently endured, will have disposed every class of our countrymen to pity the sufferings of their brethren elsewhere ; and the spirit of generous rivalry which animates all the subjects of this great empire, will not suffer itself to be outstripped by any other country in forwarding a good work, which spreads religion at home, and charity all over the world.

To the Catholics of Great Britain we appeal ! To the children of confessors and martyrs, whose only comfort and support was that religion which we seek to spread, we appeal : we call on your gratitude to aid her cause. To the lofty spirit which endured, and the Catholic spirit which has forgiven

persecution, we appeal. We claim its zealous assistance for still suffering churches. To the descendants of a people which in its hour of darkness was fain to receive the light of faith from foreign missionaries, we appeal. In the name of those who yet abide in the shadow of death, we invoke sympathy for the missionary and his flock.

In aiding strangers by this little subscription, can you think that you prejudice any nearer and more domestic claim? We do not ask you to alter, but to extend your charity: and, were it otherwise, the diminished fund would be compensated by a more valuable equivalent. Increasing zeal would supply the deficiency, and the good example of your growing piety would do more for your country than many halfpence. France has found it so: she has gained more by the spread of religion than she would have lost if the whole funds of the society had been subtracted from her charities. And France was already Catholic. England is yet to be converted.

We are, &c.

By order of the Council,

T. C. ANSTEY.

H. R. BAGSHAW.

JOHN GRADY.

J. HARDMAN.

CHARLES WELD.

Secretaries.

MISSIONS OF TONQUIN AND COCHIN CHINA;

In a recent number we presented our readers with an account of the persecution which is raging at Cochin China, and other countries adjacent thereto. We now lay before them the following petition, fully confident that those who peruse it, will offer their prayers to the throne of Mercy, to turn away the wrath which is desolating the Church of Indo-China.

MOST HOLY FATHER.—Your Holiness is well aware that the tyrant of Tonquin and Cochin China has been for some years inflicting a most furious persecution against the preachers and professors of the holy Christian religion, which he is striving to extirpate utterly out of his dominions.

The paternal and tender feelings of your Holiness must doubtless be bitterly aggrieved by the numberless calamities, which afflict the ere now, flourishing missions of Tonquin and Cochin China, and by the dangers to which the missionaries there are continually exposed, and your Holiness tenderly compassionates the Christians, who are cast amidst the fierce raging of the storm. Therefore to encourage and induce the Catholics in these parts, and particularly those who have enrolled themselves as members of the 'Propagation of the Faith,' to succour the aforesaid missions by imploring the divine mercy upon them,—We, the superior and the directors of the Seminary of Foreign Missions, most confidently entreat your Holiness to open the treasure of the sacred Indulgences in behalf of such of the faithful, as by pious prayers or other good works shall employ themselves to obtain from God that He turn away his anger from the missions of Tonquin, Cochin China, and of China also, and that He curb the fury of the persecutors of the christian name, and for this end shall recommend the same missions to the divine Heart of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to the most sacred Heart of the Immaculate Virgin Mary, and to St. Joseph, the particular patron and protector of those missions.

Therefore the above petitioners desire and humbly pray your Holiness,

1st. To vouchsafe to grant a partial Indulgence of three hundred days to those, who, moved with compassion for the Eastern Churches, which are suffering the storm of persecution, shall pray for them;—the indulgence being available as often as they do the same;—whether they recommend them to the

divine mercy in their ordinary prayers, or practise some act of piety or mortification to the same end, or perform some special and extraordinary good work to obtain peace and tranquillity for the forenamed Churches.

2ndly. To vouchsafe to grant a partial indulgence of a hundred days in favor of those who shall recite, at least once a day, the following pious invocations : ' Most sacred Heart of Jesus have mercy on us—most blessed Heart of Mary pray for us—St. Joseph, spouse of the Blessed Virgin Mary, pray for us.'

3rdly. To vouchsafe to grant a plenary indulgence in favor of those who shall continue to recite daily these invocations, or who at least shall offer each day to God some of their ordinary acts of devotion in behalf of these persecuted churches: which indulgence may be gained four times in the year by those who, being truly penitents shall confess and receive holy Communion once in each of the months of March, May, September and December, and shall piously offer up their prayers for the ends usually prescribed.

4thly. That these Indulgences which your Holiness may be pleased to grant, may be applicable, by way of suffrage, to the Faithful Departed.,

5thly. That these Indulgences may continue in force as long as the present raging persecution shall continue to afflict the missions of Tonquin and Cochinchina; and that these indulgences shall then only cease, when peace shall have been restored to the forenamed Churches.

Wherefore at an audience of his Holiness held on the 7th April, 1839, I, the undersigned Secretary of the Propagation of the Faith having presented the petition, our most Holy Father by divine mercy, Pope Gregory, XVI., having reflected on the matter, graciously granted the prayed Indulgences, notwithstanding everything to the contrary.

Given at Rome in the Palace of the Sacred Congregation, the same day and year as abovenamed.

Given gratis without fee on any pretext whatsoever.

(Signed) J. ARCHBISHOP OF EDESSA.

True Copy. C. Langlois. Protonotary Apostolick and Superior of the Seminary of Foreign Missions, 22d July, 1839.

Revised and published according to its tenor in the Diocese of Paris. Paris the 20th May, 1839.

(Signed) MOREL, V. G.

By command.

(Signed) MOLINIER.

Secy. of the Congregation.

Revised and published according to its tenor in the Vicariate Apostolick of Bengal:

+ JOHN LEWIS, BISHOP OF ISAUROPOLIS.
V. A. B.

Calcutta, 26th November, 1839.

Selections.

ON CONVERSION TO CATHOLICITY.

There is no artifice more iniquitously and at the same time more industriously employed by the adversaries of the Catholic religion in this country, to impede its progress and avert the eye of investigation from its sacred tenets, than that of degrading every illustrious convert who has had the boldness to profess himself a Catholic, by some imputation either on his moral or his intellectual character. How unsullied soever the morals, however bright the genius, however solid the attainments of the convert, instantaneously it is whispered

on all sides in Protestant company, and that without the least foundation, or even without the least inquiry into the character of the man,—‘I am told that he was always considered a little disordered in his mind;’ or,—‘It is no great loss; he is gone over to a religion where he may easily obtain forgiveness for certain frailties to which he is peculiarly prone.’ Such are the stratagems of the enemy, and, stale as they are, they never fail to be repeated in every circle as certain indubitable truths that require no proofs or attestation on the part of the calumniator. Innumerable are the instances of such unmanly detraction and malignity exercised towards the characters of individuals since the birth of the Church of England, and many a convert of most profound piety and learning united to the soundest judgment have, we ourselves met with, who, with a smile of contempt, has pointed out to us the very pages of the press where the pretended infirmity of his mind has been made the subject of most grave and serious lamentation. Those who are desirous of speaking with most tenderness concerning their fallen friend, as they denominate him, content themselves with exclaiming,—‘Well, it is all perhaps for the best; for, though a very good man, his mind was always dissatisfied; he was ever on the fret, and studious of objections.’ So far as to their general stratagem in silencing inquiry as to the motives that operate upon the minds of men in adopting the religion of their ancestors. Vain artifice! shallow system of delusion! The rapid succession of conspicuous and exalted characters that have, within these few years past, abandoned the faith of Protestants and associated themselves to the Church of ages supersedes the necessity of proving that vigour of intellect rather than debility or dullness is the characteristic of converts in general. The words of the learned Protestant bishop of Gloucester, Dr. Goodman, who, in the reign of Charles the I., left this memorable avowal in his last will and testament,—‘I do acknowledge the Church of Rome to be the mother church, and I do verily believe that no other church hath any salvation in it but only so far as it concur with the Church of Rome,’—these words, we say, constitute the subject of rumination in the mind of every Protestant long before he withdraws himself from all connection with his brethren in the paths of error. The convert is aware that the moment he makes up his mind to combat vigorously against the pride of nature and the prejudices of education by professing himself a Catholic, that very moment will be let loose against him the venom of innumerable tongues, all vying with each other to blast his character by every base insinuation and inuendo; so that, previous to the least acquaintance with the man, there is presumptive evidence in the mind of every Catholic that fortitude and manliness, instead of weakness, is a primary ingredient in the convert’s character.

We were led into these observations by the inexpressible pleasure which we derive, in common with our fellow Catholics in general, from the almost daily enlightenment of pious and sincere Protestants who have of late years, to the sacrifice of all their worldly prospects, come over to our communion. Little do Protestants reflect, when the name of any one individual who has proclaimed himself a convert to Catholicity is presented to their view, what innumerable proselytes are sure to be the result of his conversion, when the little spark of piety which animated his bosom whilst a Protestant is kindled into a blaze of everglowing zeal at the altars of the true church! It is not in the power of men like these to sink into a state of inglorious repose and inactivity, contented with having been themselves reclaimed from error. No; to court obscurity and silence would be, in their estimation a virtual shame and admission of dishonour in associating themselves to the church of ages. Accordingly we find, ever since the period of the Reformation, that the sincere convert, whether priest or layman, has ever shuddered at any thing like tepidity in the sacred cause, as if it were a mortal sin of the deadliest description. The clamour of conscience is ever sounding in their ears and telling them that it is criminal on their part, after the inestimable benefit they have received, to remain silent. ‘If we are to judge of Dryden’s sincerity in his new faith (says Sir Walter Scott) by the determined firmness with which he

retained it through good report and bad report, we must allow him to have been a martyr, or at least a confessor in the Catholic cause'....' Again (continues Sir Walter) Dryden's adherence to it, with all the poverty, reproach and even persecution which followed the profession, argued a deep and substantial conviction of the truth of the doctrines it inculcated.' Such is the acknowledgment of Sir Walter Scott concerning the sincerity of Dryden's conversion; and we cannot refuse in this instance the praise of candour and liberality on the part of a biographer who most undoubtedly did not live long enough to purify his breast from early-imbibed prejudices against the Catholic religion. But let us hear Dryden himself. He writes thus in a letter to a Mrs. Steward:—The court rather speaks kindly of me than does any thing for me, though they promise largely, and perhaps they think I will advance as they go backward, in which they will be much deceived, for I can never go an inch beyond my conscience and my honour. If they will consider me as a man who has done his best to improve the language, and especially the poetry, and will be content with my acquiescence under the present form of government, and forbearing satire on it, that I can promise, because I can perform it; but I can neither take the oaths nor forsake my religion, because I know not what church to go to if I leave the Catholic, they are all so divided among themselves in matters of faith necessary to salvation, and yet all assuming the name of Protestants. May God be pleased to open your eyes as he has opened mine! Truth is but one, and they who have once heard of it can plead no excuse if they do not embrace it. But these are thoughts too serious for a trifling letter.' Upon which Sir Walter makes the following observations:—'If, therefore, adherence to the communion of a falling sect, loaded too at that time with heavy disqualifications, and liable to yet more dangerous suspicions, can be allowed as a proof of sincerity, we can hardly question that Dryden was, from the date of his conviction, a serious and sincere Roman Catholic.'

Well done again, Sir Walter Scott! Few of your countrymen would have made a similar acknowledgment. But to the question. The exclamation of the immortal Dryden in his letter to the lady just named, '*May God be pleased to open your eyes as he has opened mine,*' is the perpetual and the ardent sigh at the present moment of several illustrious converts whose names and whose writings contribute to shed such a lustre on the sacred cause; and, thanks be to the Giver of all good gifts, their talents keep pace with their zeal and piety 'in opening the eyes of others.' No neutrality, no indifference in such a cause is the incessant cry of every genuine convert. The narcotic infection (they exclaim) of the lukewarm Catholic, who, having been most providentially familiarized from his infancy to the true light, never panted to dart a ray of it upon his benighted neighbour, shall never operate as an example upon us, or induce us to grow lax and torpid in diffusing to the utmost of our power those salutary doctrines by which our own souls have been suddenly resuscitated as it were from the darkness of the grave. Thus reasoned Dryden, and his elegant translation of the life of that illustrious saint, St. Francis Xavier, was one of the innumerable consequences of such reasoning. Thus also reason, and will continue, with the grace of God, to reason to their dying day, the Hon. and Rev. Mr. Spencer and the Rev. Mr. Mason, and among our converted laymen, Mr. Kenelm Digby, Mr. Ambrose Philipps, and the brilliantly talented Mr. Welby Pugin. The exertions of these gentlemen are beyond all praise, and happy are we to find that our humble and unassuming pages are made the vehicle to convey to the Catholic world such talented effusions of genius from the pen of the last-named gentleman—effusions which, we are proud to say, are sufficient of themselves to give celebrity to our Journal, and render it secure, so long as they are kindly continued, of an extensive circulation, and, consequently, of equal utility in giving spread to the aphorism of Dryden,—'*Truth is but one, and they who have once heard of it can plead no excuse if they do not embrace it.*'—*London Orthodox Journal.*

MEMOIR OF THE LATE ABBOT OF LA TRAPPE,

OF MELRAYE, DIOCESE OF MANTES.

THE Rev. Father Anthony, Abbot of La Trappe, at Melraye, whose death has been lately announced in the Paris journals, was more generally known before the first revolution by the name of the Rev. A. Saulnier. He was installed early after his ordination as canon of the cathedral of Sens. During the revolution he left France, and entered into the religious community of the Trappist monks, at Darfeld, in Germany. Thence he went to England with some of his religious, and, together with them, was most kindly and hospitably received by Thomas Weld, Esq., who offered them as an asylum of refuge, his extensive mansion at Lullworth. The religious, there observed the rule of their order with fervour and devotion; but, being prohibited from receiving novices, they went to establish themselves, in France. The Rev. father, who is the subject of our present memoir, there purchased the ancient abbey of Melraye, of the Cistercian order, in the diocese of Nantes. Thither, in conjunction with his brethren, he betook himself, in the year 1817. The severe trials the holy men endured in the year 1831 are still fresh in the remembrance of our readers, and the courage and fortitude which the virtuous abbot there displayed gained for him the admiration of Catholic Europe, while it rendered him more dear and more beloved to those who had placed themselves under his guidance. We are unable to record the many virtues of this pious solitary; and his fervour in devotion, his conformity to the will of God, his assiduity in prayer, and his severe austerities, must lay concealed in the cloister, which alone was witness of them till they receive from his God their judgment and reward. We have been favoured with the following details of his last moments by a kind correspondent, which we have pleasure in submitting to our readers:—

‘At seven in the evening, when the last tones of the plain chant, *Salve Regina*, had died away, this holy father absorbed in silent contemplation, retired to his cell. Scarcely had he thrown himself on his pallet, an alteration which, though his age required, he was with difficulty persuaded to accept, than he was attacked with a violent spasmodic affection. Always intrepid and courageous, he struggled against the acuteness of the pain, and when, at midnight, his pale lamp was brought him, to announce the time for prayer, so far from uttering a complaint, that the Rev. father hastened to rise and went towards the church; but, as he was proceeding along the corridor, his strength failed him and he fell to the ground. One of his brethren passing by, and perceiving his worthy abbot in this situation, immediately afforded him his assistance. He raised him from the ground, conducted him to his cell, and placed him once more upon his humble pallet. ‘Death,’ said he to the prior who was at his side, ‘has come upon me; send me hither my confessor. And they endeavoured to persuade him that there was no danger. Nevertheless, with a calmness and composure which virtue gives to her votaries in the hour of trial, he still persisted that the chill of death was upon him. Laid upon sackcloth and ashes, and with sentiments of compunction for the past, sweetened with hopes for the future, he received the last unction and benediction with which the church prepares her children for their wrestle with mortality. The religious assembled round this venerated patriarch, grown grey in virtue, and solicited from him his paternal benediction. ‘Do you ask from me, exclaimed the dying abbot, ‘a blessing—from me, who am a sinner, and for forty-eight years have been doing penance?’ And, upon their renewed solicitations, he raised his hands and eyes to heaven, invoking the name of his Almighty Father, his strength and refuge: he implored forgiveness from above and forgiveness from those who kept watch round his couch;

he gave them advice and counsel, besought their prayers, and then blessed them in return; meanwhile his strength became more exhausted, his eyes more dim, his voice more feeble, and, before the day dawned, he resigned his blessed soul without a struggle into the hands of Him who gave it birth; thus verifying in himself, 'That if it be hard to live in religion, it is yet sweet to die in its embrace.'

Soon after, according to the custom of La Trappe, the remains of this venerable man were laid at the foot of the sanctuary. There was no gorgeous funeral drapery to mourn for him, no costly coffin to inclose his ashes, no pompous apparel to swathe his limbs; but there was a dim lamp, that burnt faintly over him—emblem of his undying soul. He was shrouded in his holy habit, which had ever reminded him 'why he went thither;' a stole was crossed around his neck a crucifix upon his breast, and his beads lay at his side. Death had not even changed one feature of his countenance, and you would have thought that he was meditating still on the awfulness of that judgment which he had now gone to await. At his feet knelt two Trappist monks, reciting, both day and night, the prayers and offices which the church offers for the departed children, and learning from him how they, too, must die.

Who is there that would wrest this last consolation from us, of praying for those whom we loved in life?—*Orth. Journal, Feb. 1839*

Intelligence.

On Tuesday, the Presentation Convent, Sexton-street, was the great point of attraction in our City.

A large and fashionably attired assemblage of ladies and gentlemen were drawn to the Convent, by their anxiety to witness the imposing ceremony of the reception of two Novices, Miss Byrne, and Miss Darrac, the daughters of two of our most worthy and excellent citizens. As the Convent bell tolled the appointed hour, the Right Revd. Dr. Ryan, preceded by a numerous attendance of his Clergy, entered the spacious school-room, which was tastefully fitted out as the place of the interesting ceremony, the interior decorations of the beautiful new chapel being yet incomplete.

The Bishop and Clergy having occupied the place set apart for them, the excellent choir of St. Michael's under the guidance of Mr. Garton, commenced a piece of appropriate and solemn music, during which, the procession of Nuns, was seen winding its solemn way through the dense crowd. It was led on by six lovely children arrayed in white robes, bearing lighted tapers in their hands, they were followed by the sisters of the order, according to their ranks, and the interesting procession was closed by the two Novices, dressed in bridal robes, emblematic alike with their espousals with their God, and their renunciation of all worldly splendour, of which, with them, they were in a little time to divest themselves for ever. The pious prelate performed the ceremonial with that dignified grace and solemnity, which all who have seen him officiate in the public service of his Church, know he can so well command. His solemn interrogations to the Novices, whether 'they renounced the world with their full and free consent' and 'were resolved to dedicate themselves to the instruction of the poor for the remainder of their lives.' The mild and cheerful firmness with which they answered in the affirmative—the solemn music—the excellent performance of the choir—in a word the whole scene imparted a deep and thrilling interest, which those who witnessed will not readily forget. Towards the close of the ceremony, the Bishop and Clergy knelt,—the choir intoned the beautiful Hymn, '*Veni Creator Spiritus*'—the Novices prostrated themselves on the floor, preparatory to receiving the influences of the Divine Spirit, which was invoked upon them, and at this moment, there was not, we are sure, a heart in the

large assemblage that was not warm with sincere feeling for their Spiritual welfare, and that did not send an accompanying prayer to Heaven. We would be depriving the entire ceremony of one of its most leading features of interest and attraction, did we omit to add that a *particularly appropriate* and eloquent discourse was pronounced on the occasion by the Rev. Mr. Murrane—a discourse, the beauty, the force and pathos of which, was universally felt and acknowledged.—*Limerick Chronicle*.

ROME.—On the 30th of November last, a secret consistory was held at the Vatican, to receive the solemn resignation of Cardinal Odescalchi, who has renounced his rank and dignities to enter the Society of Jesus. His holiness mentioned, in his allocution to the Sacred College, the earnest prayers addressed to him by his eminence to obtain his consent, and the regret which he felt at being obliged at length to yield to his petition. Cardinal Odescalchi belongs to one of the first families in Germany and Italy, and has filled some of the most important offices in the Church. He was, at the time of his resignation, cardinal-bishop of Sabina; one of the six suburban dioceses; vicar-general of his holiness, and administrator of the diocese of Rome; archpriest of Sta Maria Maggiore; grand prior of the order of St. John of Jerusalem, at Rome; prefect of two congregations of cardinals, and member of ten others; protector of the Austrian nation, of six religious orders, and of sixty congregations, churches, monasteries, and cities. Monsignor Cadolini presented his cardinal's hat to the pope, who, after conferring with the cardinals, received it; and then proceeded to create another cardinal in his place, as is customary in such circumstances. Upon the same day his holiness addressed to him a brief, allowing his resignation, but expressing his sorrow at it, and recommending himself to his prayers. He is now in the noviciate of the Society of Jesus, at Verona. Cardinal Della Porta Rodiani has been appointed vicar-general of Rome in his stead, and cardinal Lambruschini has succeeded him as grand prior of the knights of St. John.—*Dublin Review for May, 1839*.

CHEADLE.—Considerable religious excitement prevails in this town and neighbourhood, owing to the extraordinary conduct of the curates of Cheadle and Oakamoor, who have been dealing out their fulminations against the Catholic Church and its members in no measured terms; such as designating Catholic Schools, places for bringing up children 'for hell,' and a Catholic church, or chapel, as the 'house of the devil.' The Rev. Dr. Rock, priest of St. Peter's, Alton Towers, felt himself called upon to notice these fiery tirades, which he did by means of handbills, which, under his direction, were circulated in the parish of Cheadle, inviting the parishioners to attend a series of discourses on the 'Introduction, Progress, and Actual State of Christianity in England,' at Golden Hill, every Wednesday and Friday evening, at seven o'clock, and in the upper school room at the village of Alton, every Tuesday and Thursday evening, at the same hour, during the month of May. The two curates, Messrs. Hawksworth and Hendrickson, issued an address to the parishioners of Cheadle, stating that they had 'seen with much concern' Dr. Rock's handbills. They did not, however, deny the charges made by Dr. R., but in a spirit of mock spirituality appealed to their people whether they could attach any blame to their 'visits of mercy and love,' and in proof of their charity, and abhorrence of all 'unseemly proceedings,' they talk of 'the great errors of popery,' of 'its idolatrous and destructive practices and doctrines,' and of the 'poisonous and deadly doctrines of popery.' Dr. Rock has well exposed the misrepresentations of the curates, in an address to his 'Protestant Fellow-Countrymen.'—*Catholic Magazine for June 1839*.

Printed by Messrs. W. Rushton and Co., Calcutta, for the Proprietors, price one rupee per month, or ten rupees per annum in advance. To non-subscribers 8 annas per number.

THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

'One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.'

NO. XXIII.

DECEMBER 7, 1839.

VOL. I.

TRADITION, NATURALLY FAITHFUL, IS BY DIVINE AID INFALLIBLE.

If Tradition be the common channel amongst mankind for the conveyance and preservation of human knowledge ; if man be so formed as to imbibe in his infancy his religious principles from no other than from the stream of Tradition, and to cherish them with fonder endearment as he advances in years ; if it be the universally established vehicle whereby religion, like other sciences, is carefully handed down through successive generations ; if it bear its waters along with such fidelity, as to keep long in existence systems of religion, which by their constructive principle tend to speedy dissolution—or with such force, as to compel those who disown its use to draw their faith from its fountains ; if these points, which in our last number we set forth and established, be unquestionably true, it is then obvious and certain, that to transmit human and divine truths to posterity, and to believe them on the authority of those who precede us, is a great moral law which directs and governs the world, and that, founded by nature, it has all the firm soundness which is requisite ordinarily to guard and secure man against error for the purposes of life. If therefore—observe our inference!—if, to impart to all men the same great revelation at first communicated to the Apostles, Jesus Christ had strengthened and confirmed the ordinary channel of Tradition, he would have rendered divinely infallible that which already was humanly secure, made the vehicle of earthly knowledge the channel of celestial, and blended in perfect harmony together the laws of Nature and of Faith.

Could Tradition,—it may be asked—unaided by the Holy Ghost, have preserved without the least change the truths delivered by Jesus Christ to his church ? Though there is nothing repugnant in the supposition, yet from the violence of the passions and man's proneness to lose sight of spiritual truths, it is probable that, in a lapse of ages, it would have been unable to preserve truth unmixed from error. Notwithstanding it would have effected much. For there is, as we have shown, a feeling in men which leads them to adhere with tenacious firmness to the doctrines, which from their youth they were taught to believe and revere. This principle would have evidently operated powerfully in favour of the true faith, planted by the Apostles in the various nations of the world ; and men, once set in the right channel, would thus have continued in it with much constancy. Like a stream which keeps to the bed opened for it

by nature, the faithful would pour along in the deep channel of truth, traced out and cut for them by Jesus Christ; and though, as we sometimes observe in a great river, which after traversing many a kingdom, has its waters divided and partly drawn off into a number of artificial canals, some of the members of the Church, might after a time, turn out from the true channel to follow various courses of their own; yet on looking back, you would for a long distance see one great united river, and easily, where the waters part, distinguish the natural bed from the others, by the expanse and depth of the stream, and by the woody majestic banks which confine it. There is therefore a natural principle in man, which, though not altogether secure and infallible, would tend to preserve unchanged the true doctrines once communicated to mankind. This is all we contend for—we ask no more. Let then the Divine Spirit of Truth aid the strength of Tradition, and without the least violation of established laws, without the least clashing between nature and grace, we have as an infallible channel of truth as if God were personally to speak to every individual.

But we proceed farther in considering the natural force and fidelity of Tradition. If Tradition, unassisted by the Divine Spirit, were to err, it would be rather in forgetting some of the doctrines delivered, than in introducing new ones: for these would presently be detected by their novelty. If these new doctrines be difficult besides, the introduction of them would meet with fresh obstacles from the very passions of men; so that to establish in one single kingdom the belief of such dogmas as the Divinity of Christ, His real presence in the blessed Eucharist, Confession, and the Holiness of Celibacy, may be looked upon as altogether impracticable; for being new, they would quickly be detected, and being either above reason or contrary to our passions, they would meet with the most vigorous opposition. How difficult then must it be to introduce the belief or practise of them into every Christian nation of the world! It would be morally impossible. It is far easier to lose in faith than to add to it. Hence the descent from Catholicity to Protestantism is easy, but the ascent from Protestantism to Catholicity difficult: because the Catholic faith is a positive faith, whilst the Protestant is chiefly negative. If the Protestant church be the Church of Christ, the world during the three first centuries was Protestant. As in the fifth century the Christian World was Catholic, it must, between the third age and the fifth, have passed from Protestant to Catholicity; or, what is the same, it must have superadded to its simple Protestant faith the numerous difficult dogmas which the Catholic Church teaches. But this could not be. For if each one is loath to abandon the faith which he imbibed in his youth, he is still more reluctant to embrace doctrines which are hard to hear and hard to practise. We know how great a labour it is to convert one man: but the difficulty increases in the compound ratio of the number; so that arduous indeed must be the task of changing the faith of millions! Yet this is not all. The Christian World has always been divided into nations different or opposite in government, interests, habits, and language. If one nation had embraced the new difficult creed, another even from a spirit of national animosity would have rejected it. To change the faith of all—and in the same way too—is a thing absolutely impossible. For though men, left to themselves, may go wrong, they will never go wrong alike,

and error can never wear one uniform aspect. If then such doctrines have been at once believed by all the churches, which compose the one Catholic Church of Jesus Christ, it is an infallible mark that they came from the pure fountain-head of Christianity; because, without detection and opposition, which would have been recorded in history, they could not have found their way into the religion of Jesus Christ. Wherefore though in some points unaided Tradition may be liable to err, yet it cannot deceive us in the above case. Again then we say, Let the Spirit of God guide and protect the traditionary stream which bears along the sublime truths of Christianity, and nothing impure will ever enter into its waters. You may drink from it as securely as from the eternal springs of the deity. It is infallible truth; for God himself preserves it from error.

The natural fidelity of Tradition is proved incontestibly on the supposition of Protestants who deny the assistance of the divine spirit with respect to Catholic Tradition. Let it be borne in mind that for 300 years the Catholic Church, under the very eyes of Protestants, has stood unchanged, and that, by their forced admission, she continued unchanged for a thousand years previous to the Reformation. Wherefore, either the Catholic Church has been assisted by the Divine Spirit, or she has not, during all this period. If she has, then her tradition is infallible, and it bears along the great truths which Jesus Christ delivered to his Apostles. If she has not, then great indeed must be the natural fidelity of tradition! For by its aid the Catholic Church, unassisted, as Protestants suppose her, by the spirit of Divine Truth, has handed down and preserved her numerous dogmas of faith without alteration for the long course of thirteen centuries. If then the Catholic Church by means of Tradition could maintain WITHOUT the spirit of God her difficult dogmatical errors, altogether unchanged for 1300 years, how easy would it have been for the true church WITH the spirit of God to preserve her simple truths for a much longer period by the same channel of Tradition? How exceedingly trust-worthy and faithful must Tradition naturally be? What an admirable means for Jesus Christ to employ, if he wished his doctrines perpetuated amongst future generations? Trust-worthy and admirable indeed! More trust-worthy and admirable than we are willing to allow. For the true reason, why tradition in the Catholic Church has been so faithful, must be ascribed to the actual and constant assistance of the Divine Spirit of Truth, which Jesus Christ promised should remain with her to the end of the world.

Tuesday last being the anniversary of the Patron Saint of St. Xavier's College, a High Mass was performed in the College-Chapel by the RIGHT REVEREND DR. TABERD, V. A. B. The choir, composed of the College Pupils, and some of the Clergy and Professors, was effectively supported by the younger Mr. Ryckmann, who played on the Seraphine in his usually masterly style. At the conclusion of the Mass, the Reverend Mr. Sumner delivered a discourse, having for his text, Proverb XXI. 28.—*An obedient man shall speak victory.* The eloquence of this Reverend Gentleman is too well known to most of our Catholic readers to require any particular encomium from us; suffice it to say, that in portraying, on the one hand, the obedience of the Apostle, he

showed his perfect submission to the Divine Will, and his resemblance to Jesus Christ *who was obedient even unto death*; and that in describing, on the other, the victories which St. Xavier achieved by his obedience, he drew the most lively and vivid pictures of the obstacles and dangers encountered by the Saint, and of the extraordinary success which attended his apostolical efforts amongst the barbarous nations of the East. In short, in treating this subject, which he had thus appositely chosen, Rev. Mr. Sumner displayed no ordinary ability, comprehension, and eloquence.

In the evening, the RIGHT REVEREND DR. CAO, Bishop of Zama, gave Benediction, when we were again delighted with the singing of the youthful choristers, whose performances reflect the highest credit on the establishment. The chapel was well attended both in the morning and evening.

We understand, that last Sunday the Catholic Pastor of Dum-Dum announced to his flock the Institution of the Propagation of the faith. The promptness and energy which the congregation displayed in responding to the appeal, evinces at once their ardent zeal for religion, and their quick perception of whatever is qualified to promote its best and dearest interests. Nearly two hundred subscribers, in the course of the day, gave in their names as members of this admirable Institution. So noble and active a display of charity deserves higher encomiums than our feeble pen is able to bestow. Yet the Catholic soldiers of Dum-Dum have only taken up the high position which belongs to them as their right. Their bright example, conspicuous afar, will not, we trust, meet in vain the eyes of the soldiers of the Fort, of Chinsurah, or of the more distant stations, who may justly deem it an honour to be imitators of so generous supporters of religion.

Since writing the above, we have heard that the Institution was announced on Wednesday evening to the soldiers at the Fort, but we have not yet learnt the result. However, we augur well of it, for we know the country which gave them birth. We are in daily expectation of hearing from Chinsurah. The Upper stations have scarcely yet been apprized of the institution.

THE RIGHT REVEREND DR. CAO, Bishop of Zama, Vicar Apostolic of Ava and Pegu, has taken his passage on the GOLCONDA, CAPT. BELL, which vessel left town yesterday for Aden, whence His Lordship will proceed to Suez in prosecution of his journey overland to Rome.

NECESSITY OF ABUSING CATHOLICISM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—I perceive that my indefatigable friend ELIA, is at his favourite work again. In the Advocate—I beg pardon, the *Christian Advocate*—of the 16th idem, he has actually advanced a new argument, which I verily believe is his own, against ‘Popery.’ Now, Mr. Editor, an original argument against ‘Popery’ being, in these days, an exceedingly rare thing, I shall state it, in order to gratify the curiosity of your readers, and that it may have its due effect in reclaiming the *popish* portion of them, for which pious purpose it was doubtless written.

After duly informing us that laymen are enjoined to confess their sins once a year to Priests, and that the latter are, as ELIA presumes,—and who does not know that a Protestant's mere assumption, if against popery, is as good any day as fact,—‘directed to confess to Bishops; but the question is, to whom do Bishops confess? If to the Pope, it is to be remembered that this is utterly impracticable * * * *’ It may also be asked to whom does the Pope himself make his confession, and from whom does he himself receive the absolution of his sins—(aye, there's the rub)—since he has no living superior, &c. ? This is quite conclusive; it would be useless to say another word on the subject: for ELIA has it been reserved thus to give a death-blow to the Popish doctrine of confession. I dare say he deemed his argument unanswerable, and I venture to say that it never will be answered.

ELIA warmly vindicates the character of the great patriarch of the Reformation, Dr. Martin Luther, so justly famed for his love of women and black-beer. ‘If,’ ELIA remarks, ‘Luther be justly chargeable with the sin of lust, the guilt of it must be laid at the door of the Catholic Church, which would reverse the natural order of things, and place undue restraints upon the legitimate indulgence of those passions which have been planted in the heart of man for wise purposes.’ Now, the truth happens to be, that so far was Luther's sin of lust from being chargeable to the Catholic Church, that we have his own admission of the fact that, while he continued a monk, he practised all the virtues of the religious state; but that no sooner did he become a reformer, then he boiled with the rage of lust. Hence it is clear, if we may be allowed to believe Luther himself, rather than ELIA, that his sin of lust was one of the first, if not indeed the very first, fruit of his new religion. And it is only justice to his memory to add, that so far was he, good man, ‘from laying undue restraints upon the legitimate indulgence of those passions, &c.’ that he *actually granted a license to Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, to have two wives at once.* No wonder that such glorious Gospel-liberty gained him followers.

ELIA's hostility to the Celibacy of the Catholic Clergy is easily accounted for. For those who are prejudiced against Clerical-celibacy are exactly in the same degree biased in favor of Clerical-matrimony, which, to say nothing of its conveniences and *agreements*, affords Protestant Missionaries their best if not only chance of encreasing the existing number of Christians in this country. It is evidently then of primary importance that the popularity of a system, so productive of personal comfort and Apostolic fruit, should be vigilantly, strenuously, and by every means, upheld. Such being the case, it cannot but be provoking to see the Catholic Clergy devoting to the erection of Churches endowment of schools, or relief of the poor, the money which should, and would,—according to the enlightened, scriptural, and Gospel-liberty system,—be expended on such evangelical necessities as ladies' bonnets and baby linen.

‘*A Catholic thinks,*’—so ELIA says, and he must be allowed to know the opinions of the Catholics better than they do themselves—‘*that if he will only pay down the price, he will be forthwith supplied with a certificat to St. Peter, who, on perusal of it, will not hesitate to give him admission into heaven, &c.*’ Let not the entire want of truth be deemed a blemish in this splendid passage, be-

cause, so long as there are dupes, among whom it will pass for truth, it will not answer ELIA's purpose a bit the worse for being *purely* false.

For it is evidently not his object, nor that of his party, to elicit truth by honest, candid, and dispassionate enquiry, but to render the Catholic Religion odious ; and provided this end can be attained, it matters not by what means,—right or wrong,—foul or fair,—just or unjust,—true or false, is all one to them. This conduct does not in general proceed from hatred to 'Popery,' as they love to designate the Catholic Religion, but from the absolute necessity they are under of keeping up such a constant dread and detestation of it in the minds of their followers, as will make them recoil with horror from the bare idea of instituting an inquiry into its real tenets ; for, if once their deluded followers were to take it into their heads to examine and judge for themselves, instead of implicitly following those who find their interest in keeping them in the beaten tracts of error and prejudice, they would immediately discover how completely they had been misled. The inevitable consequence would be that the self-constituted preachers, would lose their influence, and with it, what they probably esteem of no less moment, their income. Thus it is that even the necessary expenses of a family conduce to inflame anti-papery zeal.

Grotius, who was himself a most learned Protestant, in one of his letters to his friend Vossius,—in which he reprobates the accusations which the Protestants so incessantly employed against the parent Church,—informs us that the excuse which their ministers made use of to him, when he reproached them for the illiberal act, was this,—*'That they found it necessary to do so for the public good of the reformed religion.'*

In reply to the above, Vossius, in like manner, tells us, that he, too, just like his friend, had been often struck with the same disingenuous conduct, and that even like him, he had sometimes remonstrated upon the subject with the ministers of Amsterdam. And their apology, too, was precisely similar to the foregoing :—*'They owned,'* he says, *'the illiberality of the thing. But,'* they added, *'if we leave off such language, our people will soon leave us.'*

ELIA makes a most unhappy effort to get over the argument that scriptures alone could not have been a sufficient rule of faith to those who could not read and understand them, by endeavouring to make the objection appear applicable to laws. That few could read, and still fewer understand written laws, is admitted. But what of that ? Do not laws always pre-suppose the existence of a visible, living authority, to promulgate and expound them ? *'It must be obvious,'* as Dr. Doyle remarks, *'to every man who is versed at all in antiquity, that the written portion of the law was only a supplement to tradition ; and that the meaning of it wherever it is doubtful, or difficult, cannot be ascertained except by the light of the same tradition.'*

'Thus,' adds the learned writer, *'where do we look for decisions upon any contested matter of right, or privilege, or title, or possession, but to judges ? Why do we employ solicitors and lawyers, to plead before them, if the law itself can decide ? And why have the judges themselves recourse to the common law, which is traditionary ; to books of authority ; to precedents ; unless that neither the statutes themselves, either do, or can, contemplate all cases ;—or that even if they did, they could not be*

justly or wisely administered unless the light of antiquity and the wisdom of past times were shed upon them ?

Let any one imagine, if he can, such an absurdity, as a state or a community without a legislator ;—duties to be discovered and performed by the dictates of each individuals own private judgment ;—laws, whose sanctions, and obligations are to be determined in the breasts, and by the feelings of individuals, and so on. Why at the mere proposal at such a system there is no one but feels at once the grossness of its absurdity ; and that it is alike repugnant to common sense, as it is inconsistent with every notion of social order. Each individual his own legislator ! And yet such as this, if not greater than this, is the absurdity which is involved in the leading maxim of the Reformation, rendering each one, as it does, the Supreme Arbiter of his own belief ; and the judge of objects, which, of all others, are the most important and incomprehensible.

After all, of what avail is it to be able to read the scriptures, even in their original language to those, who like the *Advocate*, are unable to prove that they really *do contain* the Word of God, and the *entire* Word of God ? It is palpably manifest to common sense, and the meanest understanding, that the man who professes to glean the tenets of his faith out of the Bible alone, without first establishing these points, rests the whole fabric of his religious belief upon a mere gratuitous assumption. Is this safe ? And is it just or reasonable to blame, nay to abuse, Catholics for refusing to build upon so uncertain a foundation ? Because they will not descend from the rock to build upon the sand ?

A LAYMAN.

P. S.—It has been remarked to me that the following expression, used in one of my communications, is susceptible of misconception : viz. ‘That Priests have power to release souls from Purgatory,’ is a piece of information for which I am entirely indebted to Joe Wolff ; I therefore think it right to state that I understood Wolff to mean that a Priest has power to release any soul from purgatory, how or when he pleases ; and it was strictly in this sense, that I said, that I was indebted to him for the information. I certainly had not to learn from that worthy, that the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass which priests are empowered to offer, is available for the relief of the souls in Purgatory ; but the doctrine that a priest received power to take a soul out of purgatory or not, just as he pleased, is, I confess, as new to me as that a Catholic can, on payment of the required price, obtain a Passport into Heaven !!!

A. L.

We must decline A LAYMAN's further communication, for we cannot at present spare more room for the *Advocate's* nauseating trash. Nor is it necessary, as our readers will have perceived that notwithstanding all the swagger and bluster of his outset, he has been quite unable to prove even the inspiration and canonicity of the scriptures, upon which his religious system is entirely based, and now endeavors to draw attention from the weakness of his cause by relating ridiculous slanders and nursery legends against Catholics and their religion. He has thus, however, afforded the Catholics of Calcutta a practical illustration of the fact that their religion can never be assailed but when it is misrepresented, and they will naturally conclude that if truth could have served our implacable opponent's cause, he would not have resorted to the use of fiction. They will now know how to appreciate the value of the reckless assertions which are constantly made against our Holy Religion.—Ed.

Selections.

ANSWERS OF THE VICARS APOSTOLIC OF INDIA to the Circular addressed to them by the RIGHT REV. DR. O'CONNOR Vicar Apostolic of Madras and Meliapore.

The following is a reply received from his Lordship the Right Revd. Pedro De. Alcantara, Bp. and V. A. of Bombay.

MOST ILLUSTRIOUS AND RIGHT REV. LORD.

To the three questions which your Lordship proposed to me in a letter I received from you yesterday, I answer as follows; to the first, which is contained in these words; 'whether the Brief *'Multa Præclare'* be authentic and have authority,' I answer that it is more evident than noon-day that it is supported with these characters. For I have received some copies of this Brief, which the Sacred Congregation de Propag. Fid. kindly transmitted to me together with a letter of the Prefect of the Congregation, in which it is enjoined me, as far as appertains to me, to assist and give effect to the execution of the Brief in question. Hence then, there is no doubt that the Brief has come direct from the Holy See, and is supported by all authority.

To the second question, in which your lordship enquires, 'whether, by virtue of this Brief, I acknowledge you and no other person as the Vicar Apostolic and Ordinary, to whom alone the care of the Roman Catholic Church of Madras and Meliapore, both in spiritual and temporal concerns, lawfully and canonically belongs.' I answer, that you are so, is beyond doubt, and if any person hold the contrary, he must in my judgment be looked upon as refractory to this most wise disposition and decision of the Roman Pontiff. It is enough to attend to the reasoning and language of the Brief itself. By virtue of this Brief I consider, hold, and respect your Lordship as Vicar Apostolic and Ordinary of the Church of Madras and Meliapore.

As to the third, proposed by your Lordship in these words, whether all Priests and Lay-persons who resist your authority, and who impede you in the administration of the spiritual and temporal concerns of the Churches committed to you, be guilty of rebellion against the Supreme Head of the Roman Catholic Church, and whether they are to be treated as Schismatics separated from the Communion of the Church, notwithstanding what these Schismatics vainly allege both concerning the right of Patronage of the Queen of Portugal in this country, and concerning the Concordats formerly entered into between the Sovereign Pontiffs and the Kings of Portugal. I answer: they who resist are evidently guilty of rebellion against the Supreme Head of the Catholic church. For the chief Pastor nullifies and makes void, in the very Brief in question, all pretensions whatsoever to right of Patronage, for reasons so strong as to admit of no reply, except from a person who would at the same time openly reject and refuse to recognize the authority of the Supreme Pontiff. The Supreme Pontiff clearly shows, by these words of exhortation of the Brief, that all who resist do incur the crime of schism, finally we doubt not that those who have hitherto resisted our will, will be susceptible of more discreet counsels, and, (mark well) will become sincerely averse to the most grievous evil of Schism.

Such is my brief answer to your Lordships questions. I know that your Lordship called on me for an answer, solely for this end, viz. that assisted by the aid and co-operation of your Brethren, you might more easily bring your adversaries to acknowledge the truth. I pray that all may adopt this counsel and provide for their last end. May God the Father of Mercies, and of all consolation support your Lordship by his divine aid and grace to pluck up

and destroy the tares that grow in the field of the Lord of Sabaoth, and to build and plant what may conduce to the salvation of souls. Farewell.

Your most humble Brother,

Bombay, 3d June, 1839.

+ FR. PEDRO DE ALCANTARA, B. V. Ap.

The following is the reply received from his Lordship the Rt. Revd. Fr. A. Pezzoni, Bp. of Esbona, and V. A. at Agra,

MOST ILLUSTRIOUS AND REVEREND LORD.

I cannot find words sufficient to express the affliction of heart, with which I heard of the religious calamities, which, even from the commencement of your Vicariate to this present day, harass without intermission, and reduce to great spiritual hazard the Church committed to your care. But what can the declaration of my opinion avail in support of your just cause, when we are engaged in a contest with those, whose will is their only reason. Nevertheless, from the sole purpose of satisfying my obligations as a most devoted servant of the Roman Catholic Church, I feel it my duty, as also a very pleasing task, to give a sincere and perspicuous answer to your Lordship's questions. Neither am I led to this, from a desire of acting the part of a slave of the Roman Court, as many vainly allege of us Ecclesiastics, but because I feel it to be a sacred duty, sanctioned by the word of God and the tradition of our ancestors, to obey the Apostolic See in all matters regarding the business of Religion and of Faith. They who are not thus disposed boast in vain of the name of Catholic, nay, they are justly to be called the sons of Belial. To the first question I answer, that no reasonable doubt can be raised against the authenticity and authority of the Pontifical Brief 'Multa Præclare.' Such a doubt can only originate with those who desire to make black white, and white black. To the second I subscribe with both thumbs, and declare that, by virtue of the aforesaid Brief, you alone, and no other, are the V. A. and Ordinary, in a provisional manner, of the Church of Madras and Meliapore, and that according to the tenor of the aforesaid Brief, all Ecclesiastical and Spiritual authority within those countries, belong to you. To the third I answer that I doubt not, that all those, whether Clergy or Laity, who offer opposition to you in the administration of your legitimate rights, can justly be declared Schismatics, and are worthy of excommunication, whereas they shamelessly excite and foment rebellion against the Supreme Head of the Church instituted by Christ our Lord notwithstanding the right of Patronage and other Concordats, which can never impede the Supreme Hierarchy in the due and proper Government of the Church. For the Spiritual interests of the faithful of Christ are to be preferred before political and legal cavillings. As to the cutting off of the rebellious from the body, I would recommend to your Lordship the admonition of St. Paul 'be instant in season, and out of season,' but in all patience and meanness, for which reason I earnestly beseech you, dearly beloved Brother, not to be too hasty in making trial of extreme remedies, and in the mean time we should have recourse to uninterrupted and fervent prayers, that God may, in his bountiful mercy, grant to his beloved Church that victory, which we cannot obtain by our labours and deliberations. Your Lordship's

Most Faithful Brother in Christ,

+ FR. A. PEZZONI, V. Ap. and Bp. of Esbona.

Given at Agra on the 5th day of June, 1839.

The following is the letter received from his Lordship the Rt. Revd. Fr. Francis Xavier, Bp. of Amata, and V. A. at Verapoly,

MOST ILLUSTRIOUS AND RT. REVD. LORD.

The Latin letter, bearing date 4th of May, which you sent me, I received towards the close of the same month, together with a printed copy of another letter addressed by your Lordship to all your colleagues the Vicars Apostolic, containing the Apostolic Diploma 'Multa Præclare' lately declared authentic even by civil authority.

W W

I congratulate you for having obtained, agreeably to your wishes, this civil confirmation of the Diploma, though in my opinion your trouble in obtaining it was to no purpose. Do you think, by this civil confirmation, to overcome the obstinacy of those who altogether resist the execution of that Brief? do you think that they for a single moment seriously doubted of the genuineness of the Brief? undoubtedly they did not, but they pretended to doubt, lest they might betray, their obstinacy against the Sovereign Pontiff, which is more evident than noon day: they wished to veil their contumacy with the cloak of doubt.

This veil has been wholly removed by your Lordship, perhaps, then, their calumnies will cease against the Vicars Apostolic, for they hitherto called them *forgers*, meaning that they fabricated the Brief in question; but will their pertinacious opposition to the execution of that *hated* Brief cease? they have even now prepared to recur to another subterfuge for their obstinacy, for they deny that the Sovereign Pontiff has the power to annul the right of Patronage granted to the Kings of Portugal.

Though every Catholic sees how futile, nay, how foolish this subterfuge is: they, still, like all other heterodox persons, will swear, yes even perjure themselves against Catholic tents: for now, separated from Catholic unity, they are traitors, they are rebels, they are Schismatics.

They are of the number of those of whom the Psalmist says ' *They have not set God before their eyes.*' (Ps. 53) they are of those of whom the Apostle John writes, Ep. 6. C. I. V. 18 and 19.) ' *Even now they are become many Antichrists and they went out from us, but they were not of us, for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have remained with us.*' What good is to be expected from them? none certainly, unless God, who exercises his Omnipotence particularly in sparing and in pitying, soften their hardened hearts. We ought therefore to pray and beseech the Almighty, that, by pouring down his grace, he would crush their obduracy, and by condign penance bring them back to the bosom of our Holy Mother the Church, from which they have departed.

But if they will not repent, let us beg of Almighty God to break down their pride and strength, that they may not injure the Faithful of Christ. In the mean time we should omit nothing which we deem prudently calculated to repress their wickedness.

Farewell.

My Lord, Your Brother Colleague and Servant,

+ FRANCIS XAVIER,

Bishop of Amata, Vicar Apostolic of Malabar.

Verapoly near Cochin, 7th June, 1839.

To the most Illustrious and Rt. Revd. D. O'Connor, Bishop of Salditan, and Vicar Apostolic of Madras.

The following is the letter received from his Lordship the Rt. Revd. J. Aloysius, Bp. of Calaminæ, &c.

MOST ILLUSTRIOUS AND REVEREND LORD.

From the 28th of May, when I received your Lordships letter, up to the present date, I have been so much harassed with grief, solicitude and the different rumours that prevailed respecting the state of the Churches of this Vicariate, that I am scarce able to send this answer to your Lordship.

Your Lordship proposed to me three question—1st *whether the Brief Multa Præclare is authentic, and have authority.* I answer in the affirmative. The said Brief came immediately from the Holy Apostolic See, and his Eminence My Lord Franzoni, Prefect de propag. Fid. sent ten copies to the Most Illustrious and Rt. Revd, Peter de Alcantra, Bishop of Antifelleyn, and Vicar Apostolic of the Great Mogul, and he requested of him, in

the name of the entire congregation, to assist the execution of the same Brief, and give it his protection.

You enquired secondly: *whether, by virtue of that Brief you and no other ought to be acknowledged as the Vicar Apostolic and Ordinary, to whom alone the care of the Church of Madras and Meliapore, both in spiritual and temporal concerns, lawfully and canonically belongs.* I answer in the affirmative. You are the true and lawful Vicar Apostolic and Ordinary of the R. C. Church of Madras and Meliapore, and you have all Ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction in the spiritual and temporal concerns of these Churches, so that all Priests and Lay persons are bound to render to you obedience and reverence.

You ask thirdly: *whether all those Priests and Lay persons, who resist my authority, and impede me in the administration of the spiritual and temporal concerns of the Churches committed to me, are not guilty of rebellion against the Supreme Head of the R. C. Church,—and whether they are not to be treated as Schismatics, separated from the Communion of the Church, notwithstanding what these Schismatics vainly allege both concerning the right of Patronage of the Queen of Portugal in this country, and concerning the Concordats formerly entered into between the Sovereign Pontiffs and the Kings of Portugal.* All these Priests and Lay persons, who resist your authority, and impede you in the administration of the spiritual and temporal concerns of the Churches committed to you by the Chief pontiff, are truly guilty of disobedience to the Supreme Head of the Catholic Church, and as such are truly Schismatics and are consequently subject to the fixed canonical penalties.

As to the right of Patronage formerly granted in token of gratitude by the Supreme pontiffs to the Kings of Portugal, it can be of no avail to the Schismatics, because it was totally abolished by Pope Gregory 16th, as may be seen from the Brief '*Multa præclare*,' for reasons therein stated. Secondly, allowing for a moment that Gregory 16th, in said Brief, did not abolish the right of Patronage, the Portuguese themselves have destroyed it by their usurpation of Church property, and by the innumerable sacrileges committed in the Church of God by taking away the sacred vessels, and converting them to profane uses, the truth of which position may be seen in the Council of Trent 22d Sess. Chap. 12 on Reformation, and on account of innumerable other evils, which it would be too tedious for me to narrate.

Your Lordships Most attached Brother

+ J. ALOYSIUS. Bp. of Calaminæ.

To the Most Illust. & Rev. Lord D. O'Connor
V. A. of Madras.

Bombay 7th June 1839.

The following is the reply received from his Lordship the Right Rev. Vincent a Rozario, Bp. of Taumaco, and V. A. of Ceylon.

MOST EXCELLENT AND REVEREND LORD.

I received on the 2nd Instant, your Excellency's letter written to me on the 4th of last May, from which it grieved me exceedingly to learn, that some individuals, both Ecclesiastics, and Lay-persons, do not yet pay obedience to your Excellency, and that they still persist obstinately in their opinions. For since I heard of your Excellency's arrival in the city of Madras, and was informed upon credible testimony, of your election to the Apostolic Vicariate of Madras, I acknowledged your Excellency, as Vicar Apostolic and Ordinary of the Roman Catholic Church of Madras; but after that I received, in the month of September 1838, together with a copy of the Apostolic Brief '*Multa Præclare*,' a letter from the most Eminent and Revd. Lord J. Ph. Cardinal Fransonius, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, I acknowledge your Excellency as Vicar Apostolic

w w 2

and Ordinary, not only of the Church of Madras, but also of the church of Meliapore.

The Apostolic Brief ' *Multa Præclare* ' which I received, is authentic and has authority ; by virtue of the same I recognize your Excellency, (and no other), as the Vicar Apostolic, and Ordinary, to whom alone, I declare, that the care of the Roman Church of Madras and Meliapore, both in spiritual and temporal concerns, lawfully and canonically belongs ; therefore all those Ecclesiastics and Lay persons, who resist your Excellency's authority, and impede you in the administration of the spiritual, and temporal concerns of the Churches committed to your Excellency, are, (notwithstanding what they vainly allege both concerning the right of Patronage of the Queen of Portugal in those countries, and concerning the Concordats formerly entered into between the Sovereign Pontiffs and the Kings of Portugal), guilty of rebellion against the Supreme Head of the Roman Catholic Church, and therefore are to be regarded, and treated as Schismatics excluded from the communion of the Church ; for when we have clear evidence in the aforesaid Apostolic Brief of the full will of Our Most Holy Father, and of the regulation made by him respecting jurisdiction, there is no longer room for dissension.

I pray God in the mean time, to preserve your Excellency long in safety and happiness.

Your Excellency's, Most Faithful Brother and humble Servant,

+ VINCENT A. ROZARIO. Bp. of Thaumaco,
Colombo, 22nd June, 1839. and V. A. of Ceylon.

To be continued.

Intelligence.

(From the Catholic Magazine, for July 1839.)

ALTON TOWERS.—CONVERSION OF MRS. PUGIN.—On Wednesday, the 8th May, on the festival of the glorious Archangel, St. Michael, Mrs. Pugin, wife of the celebrated architect, A. Welby Pugin, Esq., made a public renunciation of Protestantism, and a solemn profession of the Catholic faith, in the chapel of St. Peter's, at Alton Towers, near Cheddle. The ceremony was grand and awfully impressive. Agreeably to ancient Catholic custom in this island, and to the present practice of the Church in Catholic countries, the aisle of the sacred edifice was bestrewn with odoriferous flowers and evergreens, emblematic of the sweetness and never-fading beauty of the heavenly Zion. From either extremity of the side galleries was extended across the chapel a handsome and tasty festoon of flowrets, from the centre of which was suspended a crown of the same materials, directly over the head of the convert. At the appointed hour, as the full organ poured forth its majestic note, the Rev. Dr. Rock, as priest, attended by the Rev. Messrs. Morgan and Fairfax, as deacon and subdeacon, walked in solemn procession from the sacristy to the sanctuary, preceded by the thurifers, acolytes, and torch-bearers. Their vestments were of the richest gold brocade. A grand high Mass was then sung, with all the usual inexpressibly affecting ceremonies of the Catholic church. Immediately after the Gospel, Dr. Rock exchanged his superb chasuble for a splendid cope, robed with which, he, at the foot of the altar, intoned the first words of the hymn to the Holy Ghost, ' *Veni Creator Spiritus*,' in the old Salisbury chaunt, which the choir continued with impressive effect. At the conclusion of the hymn, the rev. celebrant recited the psalm, ' *Miserere*,' with the versicles and responses, according to the Roman

ritual. The subdeacon then lighted a large wax taper, ornamented in the style of the fifteenth century, which from its beauty merits a particular description. It arose out of a bouquet of rare exotic flowers. Around the lower part of this candle were rolled three labels, written in Gothic characters, with the following ejaculations :—‘ Jesu fili Dei, miserere mei.’—‘ O mater, fili Dei, memento mei.’—‘ St. Michael, ora pro me.’ The higher part was ornamented with a wreath of flowers in brilliant colours, above which, attached by a golden string, was suspended a small Gothic label, upon the richly diapered ground of which was emblazoned, in the style of the fifteenth century, the Archangel St. Michael overcoming Satan. Supported on his right and left by the deacon and subdeacon, Dr. Rock placed this beautiful taper in the hand of Mrs. Pugin, who, with this emblem of faith and an edifying life before her, read, in the presence of the officiating ministers and a large body of spectators, her recantation of protestantism and her profession of the Catholic creed. The Rev. Dr. Rock afterwards addressed a short, but eloquent and applicable discourse to her, portraying the figurative signification of the flowers, the wreath, the lighted candle, and the blaze of wax tapers crowding the altar, which he represented as denoting the beauty of the heavenly paradise, the splendour of the crown of glory awarded to the just, and the admonition of our Redeemer in the Gospel, ‘let your light so shine before men, that others, seeing your good works, may glorify God your heavenly Father.’ He congratulated her on ‘coming to Mount Zion, the city of the Living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to the company of many thousands of angels, and to the church of the first-born who are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of the just made perfect.’ He congratulated her on her return to the bosom of that church which had been the foster-mother of all the saints who had ever lived throughout the christian world, and he exhorted her to show by her example, much more than by her words, that she was Catholic in heart as well as in profession. The celebration of the high Mass was then continued in the usual majestic manner. The ‘Te Deum’ was chaunted by the choir at the conclusion, and a solemn benediction was pronounced by the celebrant over the deeply affected convert, whose mind and soul seemed wholly absorbed with the momentous proceedings in which she was taking so prominent a part. The crowd which filled the chapel consisted chiefly of Protestants, who beheld the whole ceremony with the most respectful and praiseworthy attention.’—*Staffordshire Examiner*.

SELBY.—A new Catholic chapel was opened here on the 16th of May. The Catholics of Selby are indebted, we understand, for this structure to the munificence of the Hon. Edward Petre.

BARROW.—On Sunday, the 16th ult. a new Catholic chapel was opened in this large village, which is pleasantly situated on the Soar, about three miles south of Loughborough. It is a neat brick edifice in the Grecian style, 60 feet by 24, and what is remarkable, it was opened for divine service not more than a month after laying the foundation stone. It stands on a rising ground at the south end of the village, and the house which is to be built for the mission, will have a commanding view of the vast plain which stretches southward of Barrow, and in the centre of which plain stands the county town of Leicester.

PARIS.—Judging from the number of Protestant churches opened in the French capital since the peace, Protestantism is there on the increase, but on inquiry it will, we believe, be found that there is only an actual increase of sects. A bare enumeration of the churches will account for those lately opened. Besides eleven French Protestant churches or temples, there are two German chapels; five English, viz., three Episcopalian and two Wesleyan, and three American chapels. The disciples of Wesley are very active, but the French people, who are truly religious, have no sympathy with Methodism, and the irreligious care as little about it as any other religious system.

In alluding to the extraordinary progress which the Catholic religion is making, in England, the *Europe*, a French periodical, adduces as a strong proof, that the Catholics had compelled the government to yield possession to them of one of the English cathedrals, with all the privileges conferred upon

the Catholic Episcopacy in the olden time ! This is merely a new version of the story which appeared in the *Morning Chronicle*.

On Pentecost Eve, Miss Oppermann of Hanover, a Protestant lady, abjured Protestantism in the chapel of the Ladies of St. Michael.

St. Pol.—A young lady of distinction of this town has lately adjured the errors of Protestantism, and been received into the Church by the Abbé Robitaille.

BOULOGNE.—The Baroness d'Ordre and Madame de Bresson, two ladies of Swiss origin, abjured Protestantism in the chapel of the Sisters de Bon Secours in this town. They were received into the Church by the Abbé Lecomte, the Vicar-General.

LYONS.—The exertions making by the Protestant sectaries to mislead the people of France, have aroused the zeal of the Catholic clergy of that country. Conferences have been held in many places under the auspices of the Bishops, and the result has been to strengthen the faithful in the faith once delivered to the saints. Amongst the most important of these conferences are those which took place at Lyons during the last year. The two chief points urged in 1838, were that of tradition and the necessity of an infallible interpreter of Scripture. The conferences of 1839 are divided into three parts. The first consists of spiritual discourses, in which will be treated the use of the breviary, the office of preaching, the obligation of residence on the part of the pastors, the love of study, compassion for the unfortunate, pastoral vigilance, &c. These subjects will occupy seven conferences, and will end in October. The conferences on the sacred Scripture will embrace different questions upon the legislation of Moses, on the primitive language, on the objections of the incredulous, who refuse to acknowledge Moses to be the author of the Pentateuch; on the passage of the Red Sea and the Jordan, on the shower of stones, the stoppage of the sun by Joshua, on Sampson, on the sacrifices of Isaac and of the daughter of Jephtha. The questions of theology will be directed against Protestantism chiefly. In the first month the infallibility of the Church will be demonstrated in the canonization of the saints and the approbation of the religious orders; in the second the same infallibility will be proved by Scripture and by dogmatical facts; in the third by the invocation of the saints and the respect paid to their relics; in the fourth month the respect paid to images and to the cross, on account of what they represent, will be treated; in the fifth the power which the Church has to make laws; in the sixth the perfection of the evangelical counsels; and in the last month the inevitable tendency of Protestantism to overturn the morality of the Gospel.

ARRAS.—The first stone of the church of St. Nicolas was lately laid by the Bishop, in the presence of an immense crowd, with all the accustomed formalities.

BORDEAUX.—On the 1st May, the foundation stone of a new church was laid here with the accustomed formalities, by the Archbishop. The Abbé Rigagnon, curé of St. Martial, assisted by his Vicars and other members of the Church, introduced the public authorities. After the stone had been blessed, and deposited in its place, the Archbishop addressed the meeting, and paid a well merited compliment to the magistrates and the faithful, who had associated together to promote the work. Mr. Matthew, in the absence of the Mayor, addressed his Grace in return.

CAMBRAY.—On the 31st April Celestine Maine, aged 27 years, abjured Protestantism in the church of Orchias in the diocese of Cambray.

FANANO.—On the 14th April, a young Jewess, named Welhelmina Resigliabjured Judaism, was baptised and duly received into the Church. She was conducted in procession to the church, and took the name of Josephine Maria Louisa at her baptism. The public authorities were present.

HOLLAND.—The rapid extension of the Catholic religion in this once bigoted and intolerant country, has been formerly noticed in our pages. The protection afforded by the present paternal government has in some degree contributed to this happy result, and the divisions and animosities which now distract the adherents of the new creeds in Holland, have had their effect in

extending the empire of faith in a land which was long considered one of the chief bulwarks of Protestantism. The Catholics alone enjoy religious repose, and they are making the most of their present condition by the erection of ecclesiastical seminaries and churches. A very fine seminary is now being erected between Bois-le-Duc and Tilbourg. Within the last few years twelve new Catholic parishes have been erected in Holland, and without including the churches which have been merely blessed, the Right Rev. Dr. Wykerslooth, the Vicar-Apostolic, who bears the title of Bishop of Curium *in partibus*, has since his consecration in 1833, already consecrated pontifically twenty-five new churches recently built. During the year 1833 three new churches, to the erection of which the government had contributed, were consecrated. These consecrations were always followed by a pontifical mass, a spectacle quite new to the Catholics of Holland. The church of Dreumel, near the town of Thiel, in Gueldres, was consecrated under the invocation of St. Barbara on 7th June. On the 26th September the church of Scalkweyk, two leagues from Utrecht, was consecrated under the invocation of St. Michael. The inhabitants of Schalkweyk are almost all Catholics. Lastly, on the 16th of October, the fine church of Gorcum, dedicated to the blessed Virgin, was consecrated with great pomp. There are also many other churches now being erected in Holland. The Bishop has finished for the year his courses of confirmation with the district of Tivente, which forms part of the province of Overijssel. The Catholics are there very numerous, and in some parts of the province the Protestants rivalled the Catholics in the respect paid to the bishop. It is difficult to form an idea of the enthusiasm displayed by these good people, who had never before seen a Bishop. Everywhere the bells were set a-ringing, and the population went out with bands of music to meet the prelate. On the 13th September the Bishop confirmed twelve hundred persons at Olden-Zaal, the chief town of the district, and on the following day he held an ordination. On the following Sunday the prelate officiated pontifically in the fine old church of St. Plechelm, one of the Apostles of the country. This church, which possesses the head of the saint in a magnificent silver shrine, was formerly collegiate. Besides these churches, the *Gazette of Breda* informs us that the Bishop of Curium solemnly opened on the 23d of May a fine church at Rozendaal, raised by Mr. Bon, the curate of the place.

The Catholics of Holland are altogether free from those annoyances as to mixed marriages, to which the Catholic subjects of the despot of Prussia are subjected. In mixed marriages the clergy do every thing which prudence can direct to bring up the issue of such marriages in the Catholic faith, and the Government is too wise not to perceive the weakness of all new laws which oppose the laws of the Church.

The Jesuits at the Hague have obtained authority to enlarge their church, not having found a suitable site for a new one elsewhere. Funds were appropriated for the enlargement on the 15th November last, and the work has been commenced. The church and the presbytery of Aarlanderveen, in the deanery of Ruyland, have been for some years in a sad state. King William, on the proposition of the Director-General of the Affairs of Catholic Worship, granted a subsidy of 4,000 florins; the State Deputies of South Holland granted 1,500; the Commune made up the remainder; the necessary repairs were made, and the church was even provided with a steeple. On the 21st of last October a thanksgiving mass was celebrated by the Archpriest, assisted by the Dean and the Curé of the place. On the 4th of last April a contract was entered into for the enlargement and reconstruction of the church of St. Theresa at the Hague, in the quarter called Hooze Westeinde, for the sum of 144,000 florins: the foundations had been contracted for in the month of December preceding, for 9,000 florins.

It is cheering to the friends of religion to read these details. Everywhere the Catholic religion is prospering, and in those countries where it has been most heavily oppressed it is rebounding with an elasticity which no fetters can restrain.

FLOWERS FROM THE HOLY FATHERS.

No. XV.

'Sagittaveras cor nostrum caritate tua; et verba tua congesta in sinu cogitationis meae urebant, et accendebant me valde.—*St. Augustini, Conf. l. 9. c. 2.*

THE arrows of thy love, my God,
Have pierced my heart, and oh, what tongue,
Of sinful heart can tell how deep!
How should I tremble at the load
That keeps me back, so cold how long—
How should I heat my breast and weep!

The height of gratitude alone
Demands excess of love's return;
Yet I am slothful, dull, and cold;
My heart is dry, and hard as stone—
I laugh when I should weep and mourn,
When I should tremble, I am bold!

Thy outward love, how infinite,
Thy hidden favours, Lord, how great—
Thy daily instance o'er me still:
Thine arm protecteth me at night,
And angels daily round me wait
To shield me from impending ill!

How should each thought, each wish—desire
Bathe in thy love, and only thine—
How should my heart, and will and soul—
Pointing to thee, be all on fire,
And flaming sparks of love divine
Send up to Thee, in ceaseless roll.

How like the glowing thurible,
Should incense clouds of prayer ascend
From my heart's altar home to thee!
How should its growing anthem swell,
How lowly on the pavement bend
Submissive to thy least decree!

Thine arrows pierce my heart, and yet
How cleaves my soul to dust and earth,
How icy cold, deformed, and base!
How idle is my past regret,
How vainly passes present dearth,
And ah! how weak my forward gaze!

God of all love! inflame me more,
Kindle my heart, and make it burn,
Here, at the Cross, I lowly burn,
Here, by the pains that Jesus bore,
To thee, my Father I return,
To thee, my heart and soul I vow!

Oh let, the arrows of thy love
Like incense on the censer fall!
From this time forth, let every thought
Rise up on ardent wings above,
And let my heart and will and all
Admit no guest where thou art not!

THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

‘One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.’

No. XXIV.

DECEMBER 14, 1839.

VOL. I.

UNANIMOUS TESTIMONY IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, A CERTAIN PROOF OF THE DI- VINE ORIGIN OF HER DOCTRINES.

We promised in our 20th number to demonstrate that the faithful transmission of Christ's doctrine by means of Tradition, and the certainty of truth which necessarily results from a unanimous decision of the churches, are conformable to two great principles of nature, which rule the moral world and hold society together. We have fulfilled our pledge with respect to the first; we now proceed to the second. If the one faith of Jesus Christ were everywhere in the Catholic Church handed down without alteration, it is obvious that, after the lapse of ages, it would be everywhere one; and if at any time it be found to be everywhere one, we have an infallible proof that it has been handed down without alteration. Hence, if it were always guarded by the Divine Spirit, it would everywhere in the Catholic Church be infallibly one and the same at any period, because everywhere it would infallibly be handed down pure and unchanged. In our 22d and 23d numbers, we proved that it *might* be safely transmitted to us, through the common channel of Tradition, established for it by nature herself. Though however, it *might* be thus safely transmitted to us in all its original purity, (and if it were, it would now necessarily be everywhere one,) yet, prescinding from or setting aside the influence of the Divine Spirit, which we suppose not to have been promised, we wish to discover, if we can, whether it has or has not been actually transmitted to us unsullied and unchanged. Like the great principle of Tradition, there is another great moral principle, akin to the former, and equally implanted in us by nature, whereby we can determine with certainty, whether simple Tradition has been faithful in handing down the one Faith of Jesus Christ. The principle—we expressed it above—is this: *If the faith now or at any period be found in the Catholic Church to be everywhere one, it is an indubitable sign, that it has been handed down from its fountainhead without change; or thus:—The steady concurrent testimony of a great number of men is an unerring criterion that the facts, which they relate, are true.* Universal consent or agreement in faith among the churches

composing the Catholic Church is a result which must needs flow from a uniformly faithful Tradition. This is manifest. We will then mount from the necessary effect to the cause which produces it, and show, that universal consent or agreement in any article or articles of faith is a certain criterion that Tradition in transmitting them has been uniformly faithful. We will first exemplify, in a supposed case, the truth of our great principle.

Let us suppose that 500 years ago some great monarch in this country drew up a code of laws, which he intended, should continue for ages the common law of India. Having selected twelve men, to whom he gave a copy of his code, and made them thoroughly acquainted with its import and meaning, he appointed them judges over twelve districts, differing in habits and language, and ordered them, each in his own district, to put the code everywhere into force, and to choose out proper persons, who being well versed in it themselves, should deliver it in its true signification to others, laying upon these an injunction in their turn to transmit it with equal care to their descendants. Looking forward into futurity, the monarch is unable to foresee in what manner his laws will be interpreted and enforced. Perhaps something will be added to the code in one district, and something taken away in another. Perhaps in a third a wrong meaning will be given to a law, and a still worse meaning in a fourth. Each district perhaps will swerve from the right interpretation of the laws, or perhaps each will adhere to it with the utmost fidelity. Though he cannot conjecture what will happen in after ages, yet with the utmost confidence he can say, 'If my laws in words and meaning be in each district handed down without alteration for 500 years, then, at the expiration of that term, my laws in every district will be the same and understood in the same sense; and if after 500 years they be found to be in all the districts the same, then in no district unquestionably will the laws have been changed either in meaning or words.' Five hundred years have passed by: a dispute arises about the signification of a certain law: we are anxious to know the intention of the lawgiver that we may follow it. What is to be done? A council is called: judges and lawyers are summoned from the twelve districts: each one gives, not his opinion of the law, but the received and established interpretation of it in the district where he resides: the interpretations of the twelve districts exactly accord. Nothing more is desired. For this general consent affords the strongest moral evidence, which can be attained, that the uniform interpretation of the twelve districts is precisely the very identical interpretation attached to the law by the great lawgiver himself.

Though some of our readers may not have reflected upon the great moral principle which we have here set forth, yet—so deeply is it ingrafted in human nature—so strong is their conviction of that which rests upon it—that they would deem those, who should deny the truth of events, attested by a great consentient authority, not less devoid of sense and reason than those misnamed philosophers, who pretend to doubt the existence of things which they see or touch. Why then do we, if we wish not to be thought madmen, believe the events of past ages recorded in history? Why do we believe the subjugation of Persia by Alexander, the triumph of Cæsar over his country, the destruction of Jerusalem under Titus, the vain attempt of Julian to rebuild the temple, the inroads of the

Turks into Europe, the fall of Constantinople, the outbreak of the Reformation, the victories of Napoleon, or the battle of the Nile—events which we have not witnessed ourselves? Why do we believe that certain opinions were held, or doctrines taught by philosophers in former ages of the world, though we never heard them broach those opinions or doctrines? Why? It is because they rest on the concurrent authority or testimony of men, which we feel cannot deceive us. Can we for an instant doubt of such facts? No! We are just as certain of them as we are of those which happen under our eyes. The authority of men affords as strong an evidence as the testimony of our senses. It is nature which bids us confide in both, and to doubt either one or the other when invested with its requisite conditions is the height of madness. The concurrent testimony of men is therefore a natural infallible criterion of the truth of the facts which they relate. Now the infallibility of the Catholic Church is placed in the one constant grand consentient voice—the universal testimony of the head and members of the church, which, existing in every age and every clime, attests in a thousand tongues, that the doctrine at present uniformly believed was the uniform belief of her sons up to the age of her founder. What authority is there, vouching for the truth of a battle, that can be compared to this?

We must here observe that it is a concurrence of testimony upon facts, not a concurrence of opinion upon questions, that is considered an unerring mark of truth. Are then the doctrines of Christianity to be looked upon in the light of facts? Here is a difficulty which must be removed, before the truth of our proposition will appear. In the Catholic Church then, every article of faith has the character of a fact attested and authenticated by the faithful in every age. For though the articles themselves are not facts, yet the preaching and belief of them in every age and country are splendid and notorious facts, as capable of being authenticated by the testimony of witnesses, as the defeat of armies or the overthrow of kingdoms. Arianism, Mahomedanism, Protestantism and Hindooism are false notions of religion; yet the diffusion and belief of these notions in the several kingdoms where they have been propagated and professed are facts which can be handed down by tradition and attested by witnesses with the utmost veracity. But for more splendid facts than these, and far more gloriously attested, are the teaching and belief of the true doctrines of Christ, in every age and country of Christendom; for here, not individuals, but whole nations in every variety of costume, habit, and language; not the simple annals of a kingdom, but histories of every form and tongue, poetry, sciences and arts; not books and records only, but paintings, statues, vessels, altars, vestments, temples, pillars are the witnesses which affirm and attest where the Christian truths sprang up and flourished. The faithful of each century, as they hand down the received doctrines to the succeeding age, bear witness that they were preached, taught, and believed by the Christians of the preceding age, and confirm their testimony by pointing to every description of monument in parchment, marble and bronze. Thus the Catholic Church is a religion of *testimony*. But the Protestant is a religion of *opinion*. For the faith of each Protestant is his own opinion of the Bible. Though he may actually follow the faith of his forefathers, yet he cannot in principle regard this as the least rule of his own. The question asked amongst

Protestants is not as amongst us, 'What is the doctrine handed down,' but 'what is the proper judgment to be formed of a passage in scripture.' As each one by virtue of the principle of PRIVATE JUDGMENT is at liberty to form what notion he pleases, there does not, and there cannot exist amongst them, a concurrence even of opinion; and though there were, it could not be an infallible test of truth. For it is only a concurrence of testimony that can challenge this high title.

In the Catholic Church there is a grand universal concurrence of opinion—or rather of belief; but this results from the unanimous concurrence of testimony, bearing witness to the great fact, that the doctrines now believed were—in every age and Christian nation, believed up to the days of the Apostles, and taught by the great founder of Christianity. Hence whatever is universally believed as an article of faith; whatever all the churches composing the Catholic Church attest to have been transmitted to them as divine truth from preceding ages, must be as infallibly true and deserving of implicit belief as any of the events of history, which rest upon the concurrent testimony of men. We cannot reasonably call the former in question more than the latter, which are considered indubitable. If it were possible for the Catholic Church to deceive us, when throughout she testifies that such or such doctrines were believed and taught in every age from the time of the Apostles, there would then be no ground for reliance on any human authority, all faith in man's testimony would be shaken, the truth of every past event might be questioned, the pages of history would be of no greater value than those of a romance, and the strong link which binds society together, and connects past ages with the present, would be snapped asunder and destroyed. For there is no authority vouching for a past event so full and complete as the authority of the Catholic Church vouching for the established belief of her doctrines. If a proper authority can deceive us in one case, it may in another. But this can never be. The authority of men is a great moral law, which keeps Truth in its due course as firmly as the law of gravitation retains the sun in its orbit. We may calculate the motions and determine the positions of one luminary with as much certainty as those of the other.

Hence, the universal belief of any doctrine in the Catholic Church, and her unanimous testimony that it has been handed down from time immemorial, are, humanly speaking, an infallible test of its divine origin. Is then the Divinity of Christ, or the Real Presence, or Confession called into question at the outbreak of the Reformation? Look around you. Does all Christendom believe it? Yes. Does it testify that the doctrine has been transmitted from times out of mind? Yes. Can you discover the time when, or the place where, or the person by whom, it was first broached? No. Is history silent as to the opposition which its introduction must have encountered? Yes. Are there writings, records, paintings, statues, temples, by which you can trace its existence up to Jesus Christ? Yes. But our enquiries extend farther than necessary! All Christendom believes the divine institution of confession. Enough! Well then—without knowing whether Jesus Christ has or has not assisted Tradition by his spirit, of this we are quite certain, that Confession was established and taught by Jesus Christ. We should look upon this fact as most certain, even though we knew that Jesus Christ had not promised to leave his spirit with his church. It is as much an undeniable fact as

any other recorded in the pages of history. It cannot possibly be false, because it rests on a grand unanimous testimony which truth alone is able to produce. The straight lines of truth, diverging from the centre, Christ, fall, like the radii of a circle, in the same manner on the wide circumference of Christendom; and when on this circumference we find them everywhere equal in length, and similar in position, we know with mathematical certainty, that they point to their true centre, Christ, and that they are the rays of truth. Wherefore, to conclude—let Jesus Christ guard the Tradition of his doctrines with His divine spirit, and in every age they will be everywhere one, and the testimony, borne to them, unanimous; let him again assist the decision, which is grounded on this unanimous testimony, and human certainty rises to the dignity of divine infallibility. Such is the beautiful and harmonious construction of the Catholic Church; infallible in her Tradition which is naturally secure;—infallible in her unanimous testimony, which naturally is a certain criterion of truth.

The following items of intelligence have been gleaned from the pages of cotemporary Journals of the past and present week, and we are persuaded they will be found interesting:

The subscribers to the Testimonial to the very Reverend Dr. St. Leger, S. J., late Vicar Apostolic of Bengal, and Reverend Mr. St. Leger, S. J., his Secretary and chaplain of Dum-Dum, will be happy to learn, that the Chalice and Cross voted them were got ready through the kindness of the very Reverend Dr. Cullen, Principal of the Irish College, Rome, and presented to those gentlemen who had them on their way to Ireland.—*Bengal Hurharu.*

From letters received by the last Overland Mail, we learn, that Mr. James F. Lackersteen, of Calcutta, on his arrival in Rome, was presented by the very Reverend Dr. St. Leger, late Vicar Apostolic of Bengal, to his Holiness Pope Gregory XVI., who received him graciously and condescended to transmit his blessing through him to his family in Bengal. His Holiness was also pleased to present Mr. Lackersteen with a Silver Medal.—*Ibid.*

Mr. W. McNally, B. A. Trinity College, Dublin, has been refused ordination by the Bishop of Barbadoes, because the candidate's wife is a Roman Catholic.—*Ibid.*

A niece of Sir Thomas Lethbridge has recently become a Roman Catholic. It is said that she was driven from home in consequence of her conversion; and that her uncle having also refused to receive her unless she abandoned her new faith, she has sought employment, and obtained it, from Lord Stourton, a Roman Catholic Peer, as governess to his children.—*Ibid.*

Miss NEWTON, daughter of the Reverend R. Newton, the Wesleyan-Methodist minister, has (it is stated) embraced the Roman Catholic faith.—*Friend of India.*

The Pope has lately created Clot Bey, first physician to Mehemet Ali, Commander of the Orders of St. Gregory the Great; and presented Mehemet Ali with a superb snuff-box and a variety of fine medals, in return for the Pacha's portrait.—*Ibid.*

ROYAL CONVERT.—The French papers announce that the Crown Prince of Denmark has become a convert to the Catholic faith, by which act he has disqualified himself from succeeding to the crown. But rather than alter the succession by introducing a stranger, it is probable that the States will repeal a law, the offspring of bigotry and intolerance.

Selections.

ON THE DIVISION OF THE COMMANDMENTS.

PART 1ST.

Not many years ago when the public mind in Ireland was wasting under the fever of political excitement and maddened by religious persecution, any reflections on the division of the Commandments would have attracted the attention of the contending parties in Great Britain and found favour with all. Interested and political Churchmen had thrown a silly importance about this subject, and even assigned the Catholic division of the Commandments as the justifying cause of intolerance and exclusion from civil rights. If an Episcopal Prince charged his Clergy to abhor their Catholic Brethren and Fathers, his charitable zeal placed in front of his pastoral, 'that Catholics transfer 'the glory of the incorruptible God,' and in 'order to disguise their conscious Idolatry resort to the artifice of wholly 'suppressing the Second Commandment.' If the professors of the ancient Religion of England knelt before the throne to implore, that they would be naturalized in the land of their birth, they were roughly repulsed by the minister of a successor to the crown of the Alfreds and Edwards with the insulting taunt, 'that Catholics do not recognize the Second Commandment.' But the providential removal of one prime minister from the theatre of political life and the generous though prudential concessions of another, weakened the secret spring which was believed to impel one of the conflicting hosts to action.* The gold and patronage of the treasury being committed to less zealous or less chimerical statesmen, the religion of the people was no longer invaded, tranquillity ensued, and topics which formerly would have excited much of angry recrimination and retort were dismissed as useless devices, or discussed and judged of with prudence and temper.

Whilst a provident and wise policy crushed bigotry at home and shook off those expensive and pernicious institutions, with which a proselytizing zeal had cumbered a Catholic country and endangered its peace ;—whilst the establishment of equal rights and just laws lighted up among the people hope and ambition, which according to Montesquieu 'are the life of a Monarchy ;'—whilst a new era of things thus arose in England, some of her colonies and dependencies, secured from the reach of public opinion and general improvement by the natural barrier that separates them from the mother country, remained stationary in their ancient prejudices. It was the misfortune of the foreign possessions of Great Britain to receive their Protestantism from the Governing country, at a time when the established religion at home was disfigured by virulent intolerance and employed to

* The history of the ways and means for carrying on religious discord in Ireland during the administration of Lord Liverpool is full of interest and curious example, especially for those who doubt the omnipotence of money. A Noble Lord, a Member of Her Majesty's Ministry and once the Wellington of the Commons, more than insinuated, that the services rendered by the fanatical declaimers against Popery to the political schemes of Lord Liverpool were so highly valued by this noble premier, that they merited for the zealous preachers a place on the secret service list. It is good to conceal the secrets of Kings and their Ministers. We will therefore for the present pass over the origin of the second Reformation disturbances in Ireland. In the death of Lord Liverpool, were extinguished the bright hopes that set on fire the zeal, or phrenzy, or the original eloquence of the itinerant Biblicists. The sword of the spirit was sheathed and the unpaid soldiers mourned in weeds over the ashes of their lead r. The truth is the time for imposture has passed, the state of things demanded a renovation, and the country began to cast off the slough.

uphold the unjust and oppressive ascendancy of a party. This political religion, so adverse to just and imperial policy, found in the distant countries a rich soil; and watched over by those who lived by its growth, it shot deep its roots. Every establishment that was erected was exclusive and intolerant. Education was proffered, the Orphan was to be adopted; but the consolations of knowledge could not be extended to the *Catholic Child*, unless he first proved his capacity by abjuring his religion; and the protection of an Asylum was afforded to the orphan even of the Catholic Soldier who had died in the service of his country, only on condition, that the forsaken child would embrace a creed, that would teach him to load the memory of his dead parent with the guilt of Idolatry.*

Independently of the slowness with which the light of improvement travels from the seat of Empire to the remote extremities, another cause has contributed to keep up this old and illiberal state of things of territories removed from the eye of the home administration. Polemical agitation being no longer fed by the royal bounty, it became an unprofitable and disreputable occupation in England. The zeal of the unemployed advocates of Biblicism turned towards more grateful climes, where as formerly in Ireland, the waters that would refresh them might bear in their current some of the golden sands of the treasury. The charity and sympathies of the pious at home were enlisted in favour of the poor benighted inhabitants of distant countries. Many a venerable matron distressed at the growth of Popery around her, has wept tears of holy pity at the apprehension, that the unenlightened Pagan too would be seduced by the ambitious and spreading religion of Rome. Preachers of kindred

* The Indian Government, to give effect to the wise and just policy of Great Britain in allowing freedom of religion to the Catholic Soldiery, forbids the Military Chaplains of the Establishment to interfere with the Catholic children of the Military Schools. We are convinced, that the authorities, who would correct the evil, are not aware, that this liberal order is evaded, and that the Catholics are defrauded of the advantages, which Government holds forth to them. We promise hereafter to return to the subject. For the present therefore we shall content ourselves with quoting a few passages from a Catechism which is taught in a Military School not very distant from the Fort. The Catholic as well as the Protestant children are obliged to commit this Catechism to memory, Protestant ministers visit and examine the School, Military underlings enforce the regulations of it. We are sure that every liberal Protestant will hear with disgust that if the Catholic child does not commit to memory the following questions and answers, he will be disgracefully punished or removed from the School. The *Catechism* is stiled,

Popery Examined; by Schoolmaster Serjeant J. J. Rawlins, H. M. 54th Regiment. Q. page 3; How is the Pope foretold and by whom. A. As a 'little horn' Dan. vii. 8, plucking up the three kingdoms of the Heruli, Ostrogoths, and Lombards. (Hence he assumes three keys in his arms and the triple crown or mitre as a temporal prince.) Q. page 3. What do 'great words against the Most High' mean. A. That the Pope should advance his authority and exact obedience to his decrees before those of God, by setting up a false worship and exact obedience to his decrees before those of God, by setting up a false worship and other Idolatrous practices. Q. page 4. How is he named by St. Paul. A. In the 2d Thess. 11., he is named 'the man of sin and son of perdition who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, shewing himself that he is God' Q. page 5. When was he pointed out as Antichrist. A. In 1124 by the Albigenses and Waldenses who identified the Pope with the 'Whore of Babylon' Rev. xvii. 5, the fourth beast of Daniel vii. 23, Rev. viii. 1, and 'the man of sin.' Q. page 5. What are the principal errors in the Romish Church? A. The Pope's supremacy; superstition; departure from Christian Worship, Idolatry. Angel Worship, strange language at departure from Christian Worship, Celibacy, Masses, seven Sacraments, Auricular Confession, Works of Supererogation, Prayers for the Dead, Purgatory, &c. Q. Page 8th. What do you observe in St. Paul's prophecies? A. The blasphemous claims and the feigned miracles of the corrupters of Christianity are described in 2 Thess. 11. 3—12 the impious doctrine and superstitious practices they would introduce are set forth 1 Tim. iv. 1. and the influence of such doctrines and practices on their followers is foretold 2 Tim. ii. 1. Q. Page 8. Why cannot Papists perceive this. A. Because 'God sends unto them a strong delusion that they should believe a lie' 2 Thess. ii. 11. An apostate master with such a class book would bestow on Catholic children a liberal education indeed. It may be a wise plan to teach the truth negatively or by contraries.

feelings were soon in requisition and sent, loaded with the blessings and munificent favours of the religious and humane, to extend the consolations of the bible or rather to wage opposition against Catholicism. Fortunately for these emissaries, they required neither education nor knowledge to proceed in their vocation. The meanest and most feeble hand can scatter the seeds of bigotry and religious discord in a soil but too well prepared for their reception. The Preachers, therefore, and their allies of the Establishment laboured according to their measure of ability. Without genius to invent new calumnies or talent to grace or give effect to the old, they imported all the stale slanders, upon which their Brethren, in better days, had prospered in Ireland. They rehearsed the vulgar effusions of men, who attempted by a gross and public forgery to delude the British people, to insult the Catholic Religion * and afterwards to escape public scorn by styling the detected imposture an ingenious device.† Thus have Evangelical teachers preached Christianity to the Pagan and thus, to insult the understanding of India, have they forced into notice, for the guidance of the Protestant mind, the garbled statements and misquotations of hired declaimers, who by the guilt of public fraud have sacrificed all claim to public confidence. It would be wonderful then, if our Missionaries allowed a topic so fertile and easy as the division of the Commandments to escape them: and in fact not many weeks since a preacher, we know not to what denomination of Protestants he belongs, addressed, in his own peculiar way of eloquence an audience consisting of a few Pagans, on the melancholy and idolatrous conduct of the Catholics in suppressing the Second Commandment.‡ Others too have indulged in similar remarks. It may be useful therefore to set right both Protestants and Catholics on this very immaterial question, around which misconception and prejudice have thrown an adventitious importance, that entitles it to attention. We take up this subject then, merely to suit the prejudices of others, and expose the foolish foundation on which politicians and Churchmen have rested unjust legislation and persecuting bigotry.

Nor can we be influenced by zeal for any particular faith. The Catholic Church is but little concerned about the particular mode in which the commandments are divided or arranged. She looks to their substance and insists on their observance. Other Churches may extol the efficacy

* A Member of Parliament presided and two or three others assisted at the meeting, at which the forged document was first produced. On the discovery of the imposture they were so much ashamed of their friends that they immediately through the Public Journals disclaimed all knowledge of the forgery and reprobated the discreditable conduct of its authors. But shame or honor were unknown to the miserable party, who found cheatery a profitable trade. With them the end justified the means; the fraud was softly stiled 'a pious invention,' 'an ingenious device.'

† We do not mean to charge this illumed Preacher with any knowledge of the profane science of reasoning, and we do not therefore expect argument from him. But as the Commentators sometimes examine the scope of the context and even the meaning of passages, we may without presumption perhaps enquire with what view the denunciation of Catholic Idolatry was proposed to a Pagan auditory. Did the Preacher hope to win over his audience to Biblicalism, and prove that his *sect* enjoyed the pure revelation by announcing that the most important portion of Christians agreed with Pagans in Idol Worship? or did he feel that he could not lay open the grounds of christianity without producing an impression favorable to Popery? Disappointed in securing even one convert, he may have deemed it wise to attempt to disgust his hearers with all religion and for that purpose he may have denounced Popery and Paganism. Bayle no doubt would have applauded such conduct and would have justified it by the paradox, that it is better for a man to have no religion than a false one. But we must vindicate our advocate of Christianity from any connection with the doubting unbeliever. He professes a liberalized Protestantism and perhaps with Beza and other Protestants he will possess that salvation is attainable in the Catholic communion or at least that Popery is some what preferable to Paganism. Unable to sound the depth of the argument, we resign the preacher and his motives to certain select *learned* meetings, in which Protestantism takes shelter of an evening to comfort and be comforted.

of Faith alone and dwell with rapture on this saving doctrine. *She* believes, that by 'works a man is justified and not by faith only.' *They* may repudiate the moral ordinances of God and substitute in their place, the misinterpreted promises of the gospel, they may preach that Christ abolished the obligation of the Decalogue and emancipated human passion from its thralldom, and may 'exult in the abuse of that freedom wherewith Christ has made us free : ' but the Catholic Church strenuously inculcates the necessity of fulfilling every precept of divine law and teaches, that every particle of the natural precepts graven on the tables of the Covenant is of eternal and indispensable obligation. She moreover requires of us to believe, that these ordinances were intended to constitute ten general Commandments, and are reducible to that number : but in what manner they are to be carved for that purpose, whether this letter or that word is to be included under the first Commandment or the second ; whether the prohibition of adultery should precede or follow the prohibition of murder, the adoption of her sentiments on these and similar questions she has never insisted upon as a condition of her communion—convinced, that he who observes the Commandments, howsoever divided, is more acceptable to their author, than he who violates the spirit of them all, by forcibly obtruding on others, what he perhaps erroneously, considers their most probable division.

Augustine, Jerome Eucherius and Bede are vouchers that the mode of dividing the decalogue as adopted by Catholics does not regard any matter of substantial importance : whilst Drs. Milner, Murray, Lingard, with innumerable British Polemics and foreign commentators both of ancient and modern times, attest, that the Catholic Church does not require conformity to her practice on this head, as a condition of her communion, and that she at all periods has considered this a question almost utterly immaterial and of indifference.

Nor did Protestant intellect view this subject in a different light.—It will be shewn hereafter that Luther, the Parent of Protestantism, Bugenhagen, the Reformer of Northern Europe, Cranmer, the Apostle of the English Church, and many other distinguished Protestants not only regarded the Catholic division as perfectly innocuous, but even adopted or rather retained it as decidedly preferable to the opposite system. Calvin himself, to whom the Protestant division owes its present celebrity, formally disclaims its importance, and (whether from diffidence or moderation let the friends of Servetus tell) prohibits that violence with which his followers supported it. In the second book of his Institutes, he teaches, that 'It is not unprofitable to study to ascertain the division of the Commandments, provided however it be borne in mind, that it is of that description of questions, on which each person should be allowed to judge as he pleases, and about which, we should not dispute or quarrel with those who differ from us in opinion.'—'But although this opinion is most pleasing to us,' (says the learned Vossius) 'yet we are far from wishing to raise odious contentions about it, and still farther from thinking it right to disturb the peace of the Church by its discussion.'—Thus it is also, Musculus, and Wicenus, and Hypercus, and every rational Protestant thought and spoke on the subject.

But reason itself demonstrates that the division of the Commandments must be a free and unimportant question among Protestants.—It is a tenet of universal Protestantism, that the Holy Scriptures contain the whole sum of Revelation, or to use the words of the 6th of the 39 Articles, that 'whatsoever is not read therein nor may be proved thereby is not to be required of any man that it should be believed : ' now what passage of Scripture states which is the second Commandment ? The Catholic and Protestant Bibles equally contain the whole body of laws ; but where does either state, whether the words 'Thou shalt not kill' constitute the 5th or 6th or the 7th Commandment ? Does

not the Catholic acknowledge as strict an obligation to obey what Protestants call the 2nd as if he himself reckoned it a separate Commandment? and does not the Protestant confess a similar obligation with regard to the precept, which Catholics call the ninth? In a word, do not both bow with equal reverence to the obligation of the self-same precepts and prohibitions? Do not both agree, that these constitute but 10 distinct commandments and must not both confess that the inspired volume does not expressly teach how these ten are to be individually enumerated? It is then evident, that any peculiar division of the Decalogue does not appertain to the Protestant creed any more than to the Catholic, or regard any point of substantial importance; and that this question, in truth, if examined on Protestant principles, becomes a question of mere scriptural criticism or perhaps of mere Biblical conjecture. Can that Church then boast of liberality or pretend to religious toleration, which has inflicted, on account of so immaterial a point, the privations and penalties of a sanguinary penal code? or what apology can screen from odium those Protestant preachers and writers who have denounced the Catholic division of the Commandments as an idolatrous and substantial depravation of the divine word? Yet it would be unreasonable to attach much censure beyond that of illiberality to those ministers, who sometimes exhibit their orthodoxy and eloquence on the corruptions of the Church of Rome. They have taken up their opinions at second hand, and they have no motive to desire either the knowledge or the disposition to examine those ready invectives, which they have received from oral tradition or from concise familiar treatises that are scattered among the people as antidotes against Popery. Supported by honourable patronage, they may disdain the aid and clumsy attainments of the school-men. An acquaintance with the lighter beauties of the University Classics, a deep knowledge of the fashionable tales and light literature of the day, improved manners and attractive endowments, will secure them a gracious reception, recommend them to a desirable settlement in life and accomplish all the objects they have in view, more effectually than dull theology or learned labours. On these grounds we presume the University Education for Protestant ministers allows only a few weeks for the study of Theology. It is not surprising then if, men of such habits, views and education would have no relish for the solid but uninviting pursuit of sound principles, or if taking a bias from friends or patrons who have grown old and rich in place and bigotry, they some times proved their zeal on the errors of Romanism, and retailed the bigotted effusions of their elders.

To prevent misconception, let it be remembered, that the matter of dispute between Catholics and Protestants is not, whether the Decalogue contains the whole sum of Man's natural duties to God and his neighbour: nor is it questioned whether the Commandments impose any new or additional burden, proceeding from the arbitrary will of God, or only promulgate to man the obligations which spring from his very nature and which all men are therefore bound to fulfil. On this obligation of keeping the Commandments, which is by far the most substantial truth connected with the Decalogue, the Church of England may have to refute the alluring doctrines of some of the religious reformers of the 16th century; but with the Catholic Church she has on this point no controversy. Indeed the 7th of the 39 Articles, which asserts the necessity of obeying the Commandments, is no more than a copy of the 11th Chapter and 10th Cannon of the 6th Session of the Council of Trent. Neither does the dispute regard the total number of the Commandments; nor whether they were originally graven on two tables of stone and ordered by divine authority to be promulgated to his people. For we read, that Moses said to the Jews, (and you came to the foot of the Mount, which burned even unto heaven; and there was darkness and a cloud and obscurity in it, and he (the Lord) shewed you his covenant which he commanded you to do and the ten words, that he wrote on two tables of stone.—Deut. iv. 11th and 13th vs. also x. 4th v. and Exod-

us xxxiv. 28th v. Thus far Jews and Christians of every denomination harmonize; because these truths are expressly recorded in the inspired volume. But no sooner does the stream of charity pass the borders of this limited Eden of peace, than it changes its name and nature and thenceforward its waters, divided into different currents, become waters of bitterness.

The controversy between Catholics and Protestants turns entirely on the mode of apportioning into ten Commandments the 16 verses of Exodus 20th chap. which commence with the 2nd and terminate with the 17th verse, and the 15 verses of Duet. 1st chap. commencing with the 6th and terminating with the 21st. It appears to have originated in an opinion, whose falsehood both parties now universally admit. Josephus the Jewish historian, before whose time even the Pharisees are not recorded to have attended to the subject, and after him, Philo and the other Jews, seeing that two tables contained all the ten commandments, concluded that five commandments must have been written upon each. Having embraced one error, they were obliged, to adopt two others in its defence. Such is the natural course of things. Knowing from tradition or otherwise, that the first table contained only the precepts regarding our duties to God, they annexed to it the precept of honouring parents, on the Cabalistic pretence, that parents being the immediate authors of our being, participate in the nature of Gods to us; and that therefore our duty to them should be ranked among those, we owe immediately to the Deity. Finding however their scheme still imperfect and that no pretext could be found for transferring any of the other precepts of the second table they were necessitated in order to complete the number, to multiply those of the first by subdividing one precept into two or by some other similar arrangement. Different systems were contrived for the purpose. The majority were for making the words 'I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt,' the 1st Commandment.—'Thou shalt not have strange Gods before me, Thou shalt not make to thyself &c.' the second. Josephus having struck upon the expedient of dividing this latter Commandment into two, this ambitious Pharisee at once succeeded in completing the number of 5 Commandments for the first table and secured to himself the honour of appearing in the page of history the first patron of that mode of dividing the Decalogue which has recently acquired so much celebrity.

Now Catholics and Protestants are equally strenuous in denying, that an equal number of the Commandments belong to each table. Protestants assign but 4, Catholics only 3, to the first table. They also unite in rejecting the 2d error of the Jews and contend, that not only does it appear congruous, that our duties to God should alone occupy a separate table, but also that the Redeemer himself intimated this distinction, when he reduced the Decalogue to the two precepts of loving God and of loving our neighbour. They also observe, that the Saviour enumerates the precept of honouring parents not among the precepts which regard God, but among those which regard Man; and whereas our parents are but part of that great family whom we are bound to love and forbid to kill or calumniate &c., they justly agree, in believing, that this Commandment is not only the first with a promise, but also the first of the second table.—*Mad. Catholic Expositor, September 1839.*

Answers of THE VICARS APOSTOLIC of INDIA to the circular addressed to them by the RIGHT REV. DR. O'CONNOR, Vicar Apostolic of Madras and Meliapore.

The following is the reply received from his Lordship the Right Rev. John Louis, Bp. of Isauropolis, and V. A. of Bengal *ad Interim.*

To the Most Illustrious and Rev. Lord, the Bp. of Salditan, and V. A. of Madras.

MOST ILLUSTRIOUS AND REVD. LORD.

I received on the 30th May, Your Lordship's letter to my address, dated the 4th May, together with an authentic copy of the Apostolic Brief 'Multa Præclare,' Your Lordship requires, that I should make known to you my opinion, first as regards the authenticity and authority of that Brief 'Multa Præclare.' Secondly whether, by virtue of the same Brief, I recognize you and no other as Vicar Apostolic of Madras. Thirdly, whether all those Priests and Lay persons, who resist your authority, are not rebels, against the Holy See, and are not to be treated as Schismatics excluded, from the communion of the Church. ?

I answer first, that I and every truly Catholic Christian, not only acknowledge the authenticity and authority of the aforesaid Apostolic Brief 'Multa Præclare,' but are also bound to an acknowledgment of it, and obliged to submit to its authority, and to reduce it to practice, as nothing is wanting to it, both as regards authenticity and as regards authority. Secondly as your Lordship has been already lawfully and canonically nominated to the Apostolic Vicariate of Madras, and as the Apostolic See has now, by the said Brief 'Multa Præclare,' decreed, that all those countries which are contained within the limits of the Diocese of Meliapore or St. Thomè are to be united to the Apostolic Vicariate of Madras, and that all jurisdiction and authority, Ecclesiastical as well as spiritual over those countries, belong to your Lordship and to your successors, I, therefore, willingly acknowledge and from my heart declare, that your Lordship is the lawful Superior of the above mentioned places, as long as the Apostolic See shall have come to no new determination. Whence thirdly, I conclude, that all Priests and Lay-persons, who profess the Roman Catholic Faith, and resist your authority, are to be looked upon as guilty of rebellion against the Supreme Head of the Roman Church and that they are excluded, as Schismatics, from the communion of the Church.

But as to what regards the right of Patronage of the Kings of Portugal I make no account of it, because the former Pontiffs did not wish, and had not even the power to tie up the hands and to weaken the authority of their Successors, especially after circumstances had been changed, and when such a Privilege has turned to the detriment of Religion. Moreover the Kings of Portugal obtained this Privilege on account of the temporal Dominion they possessed in India, but now as the temporal Dominion ceases, the spiritual Privilege ceases likewise, for when the cause ceases the effect also ceases. Your Lordship may remember the conduct of Pius 7th of blessed memory, in his Concordat with Napoléon in 1802; the submission of the French Clergy to the decrees of the Sovereign Pontiff, is an instance better than all proofs.

Your Lordship's Most Faithful Brother in Christ,

+ JOHN LOUIS Bp. of Isauropolis,

V. A. of Bengal, *ad interim*.

Given at Calcutta, on the 24th June 1839.,

The following is the reply received from his Excellency, the Very Revd. P. J. N. Calmels, Prefect Apostolic of the French Colonies in the East Indies.

Pondicherry, 25th May, 1839.

MOST ILLUSTRIOUS AND REVD. FATHER AND LORD,

I received with the most profound respect an Authenticated copy of the Apostolic Brief 'Multa Præclare,' which your Excellency directed to me, together with your letter dated the 4th of this month.

The Apostolic Brief aforesaid, which begins with the words 'Multa Præclare' is truly authentic, and all Christians are bound to render obedience to it. I have long since acknowledged its authenticity, and in order that it

might be received as authentic within our French Colonies, and that its provisions might be duly executed, I addressed a letter, on last Christmas day, to all the Faithful inhabiting the said Colonies.

Also by virtue of the aforesaid Brief, all jurisdiction and authority, Ecclesiastical and Spiritual, over all those countries, which are contained within the limits of the Diocese of Meliapore or St. Thomé, and which had been previously committed to no Vicar Apostolic, belong truly to your Excellency, as the only legitimate Pastor and Ordinary of those countries; and consequently to you also belongs the administration of the temporal concerns both of the Church of Madras, and of the Church of Meliapore, within the limits assigned to your jurisdiction aforesaid.

Finally, whosoever, whether Clergy, or Laity, resist your Excellency's jurisdiction and authority, of which I have spoken above, and impede you in the administration of the temporal and spiritual concerns in your charge are truly guilty of rebellion against the Sovereign Pontiff, the Head and Chief of the Roman Catholic Church, and as such, ought to be regarded by us, according to the word of the Lord 'as Heathens and Publicans,' notwithstanding what these rebels might vainly allege both concerning the right of Patronage of the Queen of Portugal in those countries, and concerning the compacts formerly entered into between the Roman Pontiffs and the Queens of Portugal.

Your Excellency's, Most devoted Servant, in Christ,

P. J. N. CALMELS, Prefect Apostolic

Of the French Colonies in the East Indies.

(To be continued.)

Intelligence.

(From the Catholic Magazine for August, 1839.)

TIXALL: CONVERSION.—On Sunday, June 30, C. Wolseley, Esq., eldest son of Sir Charles Wolseley, Bart., made a public abjuration of Protestantism, and was formally admitted into the Catholic Church, in the chapel at Tixall.

COLERAINE: CONVERSIONS.—Forty adults have been lately received into the bosom of the Catholic Church by the Rev. Mr. Green.

PARIS.—It is with feelings of pleasure that we state that religion is making rapid strides amongst the upper classes in France. The seeds of infidelity, which had taken deep root in England long before they were sown in the former country, would probably have never come to maturity in France, had they not received nutrition from the vices of the aristocracy, the profligacy of whose example did more to unhinge the faith of the French people, than the writings of Voltaire, Rousseau, and all the other philosophers put together; for to the vast majority of the nation, these writings were sealed, as they still are. Whether for good or evil, example is much more powerful with the bulk of mankind, than precept; and though it is easier to keep a man in the way of his duty, than to reclaim him after he has transgressed; yet we are not without hopes that the example now shown by the higher classes of the French people will have a most beneficial effect upon the humbler orders, and that the aristocracy of the present day will thus atone for the wickedness of their forefathers. Since the restoration of the Bourbons, foreign Protestants, particularly those of this country, have looked upon France as a fruitful field for the exercise of their Christian benevolence; but we believe they have made no progress. The fact is, that Protestantism is too cold a system to have any influence with a lively people like the French.

We observe that the Anglican Bishop Luscombe has been delivering a series of anti-Catholic sermons at Paris, which he has translated into French,

and published under the title *L'Eglise romaine comparée avec la Bible, les Pères de l'Eglise, et l'Eglise Anglicane*. As Dr. Luscombe was sent to Paris for the benefit of English Protestants, we consider the publication of his sermons, in *French*, to be a piece of gratuitous meddling with the religion of the French people; yet, as a lover of fair play, and as a friend to truth; we have no objection to the publication. It will, we have no doubt, be satisfactorily answered; and we would recommend to his antagonists, *ante omnia*, to inquire who Dr. Luscombe is, and to ask for his credentials as a successor of the Apostles? The discussion will tend to open the eyes of the Protestant residents. Perhaps Dr. Luscombe may excuse himself in this attempt to catch some weeds thrown from the Pope's garden, by the inroads made upon his own flock; for we happen to know that some of them have been already received into the pale of the Catholic Church, and that more are about to enter. We would strongly recommend to the Archbishop of Paris, as a set-off, to appoint one of his clergy to deliver a course of controversial lectures, in *English*, and we are quite certain that many conversions would be the result. A difficulty might arise in finding a clergyman with a sufficient knowledge of the language; but we know one clergyman who is fully competent to the task,—we mean the Abbé de Maligny, whom we have heard deliver an excellent discourse, in *English*, from the pulpit of one of the Catholic chapels at Edinburgh. We trust that these remarks will meet with consideration in the proper quarter.

M. Studach, the Vicar Apostolic of Sweden, is now at Paris, with the view of getting some ladies to superintend a female school he is about to establish at Stockholm. The principal supporter of the Catholic religion in Sweden is the Princess Josephine, daughter of the Duke of Leuchtenberg, and niece of the present King of Bavaria: she is married to the Prince Royal of Sweden. We trust, that if the family of Bernadotte continue to reign, they will be able to obtain a repeal of the law excluding Catholics from the throne of Sweden. No event would sooner hasten the return of the people of that country to the ancient faith, than the sway of a Catholic sovereign: we might then expect to see Sweden a virtuous nation, instead of being, as it now is, one of the most immoral in the world.

ROME.—Colonel de Lentulus, a Swiss Protestant, after being instructed in the Catholic faith, made his abjuration of Protestantism, and was received into the Church.

NAPLES.—On the 13th, two missionaries left the Chinese College, at Naples, to return to their native country. Their names are, Augustine Ton, and Valentine See: they have been several years in the college, and were ordained priests last year. They have gone to Rome to place themselves at the disposal of the Propaganda.

CHINA.—The Directors of the Seminary of Foreign Missions at Paris, have lately received a letter from Dr. Fontana, Bishop of Sinite, Vicar Apostolic, of Su-Tchuen, dated 3rd Sept. 1838, in which he mentions the death of the Rev. John Anthony Escodeca de la Boissonnade, at the age of seventy-four, who, for more than ten years, had lived among the cold and barren mountains of Tong-Tchang-Ho. Father Escodeca was forced to leave France after the revolution of 1789, for his refusal to take the oath to the civil constitution of the clergy, and having become acquainted at Venice, in 1799, with two directors of the Seminary of Foreign Missions, offered himself for the mission, and in 1800 embarked for Macao. He arrived at the mission of Su-Tchuen, in 1805. Dr. Fontana also mentions the loss, during the course of the year, of four young Chinese priests, three of whom had received their education at Pulo-Pinang. Their loss had, however, been happily supplied by the arrival of the missionaries Papin and Delamarre, who left France in 1830, and M. Favand who left in 1833. Dr. Hubert, elected bishop of Canope, and successor of Dr. Bruguieres, Vicar Apostolic of Corea, had likewise paid the debt of nature.

Rumours of persecution had, for some months past, disturbed the missionaries; and a native Christian, after confessing his faith, had been condemned

to perpetual exile in Tartary. The underlings of the government always avail themselves of these rumours to extort money from the Christians. Only one Mandarin, viz. of King-Tang-Kien, had obeyed the order to search for the preachers of our faith; but as the priests happened to be absent on their duties when search was made for them, they fortunately escaped. Last year was signalized by many conversions to the faith in the province of Yd-Nan. The following account of the administration of the Sacraments in the Vicariate of Su-Tchuen is cheering: annual confessions, 35,814; confessions repeated, 3,276; annual communions 12,186; communions repeated, 3,124; new catechumens, 289; adults baptized, 305; adults baptized in danger of death, 88, of which number, 45 died; children of christians baptized, 1808; children of pagans baptized in danger of death, 7991, of which number, it is thought, 4737 died; confirmations, 2049; marriages blest, 269; sick who received extreme unction, 504; adults who died, 804; children deceased, 638; Christians who did not go to confession, 1973; Christians who were not visited, 1665; boys' schools, 33; girls' schools, 66.

The Abbé Dubois, superior of the Foreign Missions, has received a letter from the Bishop of Maxula, Coadjutor of the Mission of Su-Tchuen, in which he gives a lamentable picture of the morality of the Chinese, who are not likely to improve by intercourse with the opium venders of Europe. Borrowing the words of M. Voisin, the bishop says, 'The Chinese empire is an immense receptacle of robbers, a vast sink of every infamy, a nest of lying and pride.' He observes that this account ought not to surprise or scandalize any one, but that it should undeceive those, whom lying books have led astray with regard to the moral character of the people of China. 'A certain air of exterior decorum may have imposed on some strangers, but the real character of the nation is bad. In the cities and towns particularly, corruption and wickedness are at their height. It is not therefore surprising that some Christians should be found here who are not what they ought to be; we ought rather to admire the wonderful power of grace, which still preserves so many virtuous souls in the midst of these Babylons and Sodoms.' The Bishop was about to visit a small congregation of Christians located on the top of a mountain ten leagues distant from the city of Ho-Tcheon, and of whose conversion he gives some curious details. It has been remarked as a singular circumstance, that when a congregation becomes rather numerous, few conversions from Paganism take place. 'What can be the reason of this?' asks the Bishop. 'Why does the Lord disseminate a certain number of little congregations over a large portion of this province? May it not be that when the moment of mercy is come for this poor people, all these sparks may the more promptly produce a universal conflagration?'

SIAM.—Few details have been received this year on the progress of Christianity in this kingdom. M. Grandjean, a French missionary, lately arrived there, writes from Bang-kok, the capital, on the 1st Feb. 1838, that he was applying himself very closely to the study of the language, previous to entering upon his missionary duties. In July preceding, he had brought over a young American sailor, an Anabaptist, to the Catholic faith. There are many Protestant ministers at Bang-kok, who, Mr. Grandjean says, scatter about their books with the most lavish profusion; they distribute large sums of money to make proselytes, but without success; for they are despised by the Pagans, because they are married. 'Since they came to Bang-kok (continues Mr. G.), at least ten years ago, I am not aware that they have baptized more than ten Pagans; and even these were men whom they redeemed from slavery, and who afterwards abandoned them. However, they do a great deal of injury to the Catholic religion, by the contempt which, without intending it, they throw upon its Divine Founder, by the absurdly ridiculous translations they publish of the Holy Gospels. The other day, a sheet fell into my hands, on which they had printed the commandments: after the last commandment, I read these remarkable words—'Whoever cannot practise those commandments, let him believe in Jesus Christ, and he shall be saved.' Thus, according to them, a debauchee,

a robber, a homicide, any man the most wickedly immoral, shall be saved, provided he believes in Jesus Christ. What doctrine ! The following extract of a letter from the Vicar Apostolic of Siam, dated 1st Feb. 1833, which also appears in the *Annales de la Propagation*, is curious :—‘ We have now, at Bangkok, six Anabaptist missionaries from America; four or five more are expected: the first who came here, no doubt, written back that they did not suffice to gather in the abundant harvest presented before them. What are they doing here? Neither more nor less than what they do elsewhere—that is, nothing. They print, in the Siamese language and characters, a great number of tracts, which they distribute gratis, and give out as the word of God in all its purity: those books are received, because they cost nothing; are laughed at—but no one is converted. These ministers, in order to secure toleration, make handsome presents to the princes and mandarins: they have built themselves commodious houses, where they spend their time agreeably, in the society of their wives and families! This is what I know of those retailers of Bibles: they can never have much success in Siam, where the people look upon it as a point of most rigorous discipline, that one consecrated to the service of the Divinity, and who calls himself the minister of God, should lead a life of celibacy! The law of the land condemns to death a Talapoin convicted of having violated this precept. Very lately, the chief priest of a pagoda was accused on this head, and cast into prison; where, rather than await his trial, he put an end to his existence by suicide.’

‘The capital of Siam contains about 200,000 inhabitants: it is nearly three leagues long, but has little breadth, the houses being all built along the river. M. Miché, a missionary, in a letter dated 4th June, 1833, gives the following description of Bangkok and its environs :—‘ On entering the river, on which the city is built, three forts, well furnished with cannon, meet the eye. One of them, resembling a little castle, rises, as if by enchantment, from the middle of the river: the other two, placed on either bank, and marked by large groups of trees, would seem destined to defend the first. At the sight of those forts, a stranger, who is proceeding to the capital, looks forward to meet a city worthy of having such fortifications; but he is much disappointed: those splendid forts, built in the European style, serve only to protect a heap of sorry huts, which form a large village, honoured with the name of capital. Figure to yourself a large river, the marshy banks of which are lined with fishermen’s huts, to the extent of two or three leagues; imagine, besides, that neither in this city nor in the environs are there streets or roads, or paths of any kind; and that to visit your neighbour, you must go in a boat :—such is Bangkok. There is nothing to be seen here which resembles in the slightest degree the magnificence of our cities in Europe, unless, perhaps, a few pagodas, and some turrets, built by the rich in honour of their gods.’ M. Miché adds: ‘Considered under another point of view, the capital of the kingdom of Siam is a tower of Babel in its tongues, and a real Babylon in its morals: the people who inhabit it are the most indolent, the most good-for-nothing, on the face of the earth; and if idleness is the parent of vice, judge what must be the condition of this nation, and how difficult it is to make the people embrace a religion of crosses and sacrifices.’

ABERDEEN.—The Catholics of this city have been the first, in Scotland, to distinguish themselves, by the formation of a branch of the Catholic Institute for Aberdeen. A public meeting was held, on the 17th April, in the large school room, Constitution-street; the Rev. Charles Gordon, the highly esteemed senior pastor, in the chair, when a series of resolutions was passed, approving of the objects of the Institute, and its proceedings. Another took place on the 1st of May; when a letter was read from the Right Rev. Dr. Kyle, Bishop of the Northern district of Scotland, accepting the office of President, which had been offered to him. The Aberdeen branch was then fully organized.

THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

'One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.'

No. XXV.

DECEMBER 21, 1839.

VOL. I.

THE MECHANICS' INSTITUTE.

We have lately had our attention more particularly directed to the operations of the Mechanics' Institution, by its having entered on the system of appointing regular evenings for the opening of its lecture room at THE SANS SOUCI, which we look upon as an entirely new feature in Calcutta Society. The situation is central, and the room is well adapted for the audience to hear distinctly every word of a lecturer. In addition to this, the Institution have established a class for instruction in Mechanics, &c., accessible to all its members, among whom we certainly hope to see numbered nearly all the inhabitants of this city, the very small subscription being within the means of every one. We more confidently direct the attention of our readers to this, because we know the effects of such Institutions in England, where, from small beginnings frequented only by a few, they have now become almost universal. It is hardly necessary to point directly to the *modus operandi* of their good effects, as it must be clear to every one, that any Society that shall afford an useful and improving occupation, to those who are just entering life during their hours of recreation, or such as are more devoted to the active duties of their business or pursuit, and to the more enlightened, shall afford a charm in recalling, in some new form, the studies and pursuits of other, perhaps of happier days, is deserving of the highest encouragement. The present plan of the committee of the Mechanics' Institution appoints every Tuesday in the week, as a lecture night, commencing at half-past six in the evening,—each alternate one of these nights is appropriated to a course of lectures, by Mr. Anderson, the fixed lecturer, who has taken Mechanics as his present subject, and attends also to the class on two other evenings in the week,—other alternate Tuesdays, are appropriated to such gentlemen, friends of the Institution, as will kindly come forward in aid of its usefulness. We see nothing that we would wish altered in this plan if it shall only be adhered to, and we can have little doubt of this when so many able men are to be found, who only seek a little encouragement to lend their assistance. In this country we are very differently situated to what they are in England;

there, most of the mechanical operations of the economy of life, most of the arts are generally known ; whilst here, we have every thing to learn, and few possess information beyond the actual necessities of their pursuit, not that experience has not had its weight in giving a lesson of knowledge to many, but that those do not attempt to communicate what they have learned, to their fellow citizens. It is this freedom in dissemination of the results of experience that is required, and we cannot look around us, and see the rude and primitive modes followed in prosecuting almost every branch of manufactures and of arts in India, without feeling the advantages to be derived from an institution, like the one we now notice, in suggesting improvements.

We have been led to these observations by attending a Lecture delivered last week to about a hundred Members of the Mechanics' Institution, by Mr. G. T. F. Speede, 'ON AGRICULTURE and its MECHANICS.' The lecturer commenced with describing the probable origin of Agriculture as ascribable to an imitation of the effects produced by the deposit of alluvial soil made by such rivers as the Nile in Egypt, and the Ganges in India—he then described the first known implements used for agricultural purposes, of which he also exhibited models,—passing thence, the lecturer set forth its history and gradual progress in England to its present state of perfection, illustrating the same by the exhibition of drawings from ancient manuscripts, and a model of the first known wheel plough. From this he passed to its state in Bengal, commencing with the primitive condition in the hills, and its more advanced state in the plains ; these being also illustrated by models of hoes and ploughs, the defects of which he particularly described, and shewed also an improvement on the latter, lately attempted by his brother and himself, whereby, one ploughing by the improved instrument, had the effect of four made by the one in ordinary use. This naturally led him to direct the attention of Europeans in this country to the mode of improvement and its gradual progress to be made, not so much by the introduction of entirely new instruments, as by alterations, rendering the present agricultural implements, used by natives, more effective and useful ; and he thus closed a rather lengthy discourse, during which, however, we are assured by many of our friends coinciding with us in opinion, the interest never once flagged, and the audience dispersed with expressions of gratification. We learn that the lecture, with drawings of the models, &c exhibited, will appear in an early number of *Dr. Corbyn's Review*.

ST. XAVIER'S COLLEGE.

We experienced very heart-felt gratification during our attendance on a lengthy and severe examination of the Students in the College of St. Francis Xavier on Tuesday last, a short report of which we have elsewhere extracted from the Englishman ; for we may, by many, be charged with a partiality to this Institution that cannot be laid to the door of our cotemporary. The examination, which took place in the school-room, fitted up as a theatre, opened with the fourth class, whose capabilities were set forth particularly in the grammatical construction of Latin, with some tact, by the Reverend Mr. Sumner. The students of the first class were then

called up, and after being examined in the translation of part of the 7th Chapter of Luke in Greek, by Dr. O'Shaughnessy, aided by Mr. Frederick Speede, were submitted to a close questioning in the grammar of the same Classic tongue, by the Reverend Mr. Sumner, to all of which they replied most satisfactorily. They next, under the same examiners, took up a portion of Cicero's 2d Oration against Cataline, the beauty and grandeur of which, as well as the construction, they appeared clearly to understand,—from this they passed under the examination of the Reverend Mr. Moré, to the fourteenth Chapter of Sallust's History of the Jugurthine war: this they very ably translated into French; it was a severe test of their capabilities, as can only be fully appreciated by those who have attempted the difficult task of translating from a dead into a foreign tongue, or from one foreign language into another equally strange. The French language being hardly ever attended to in any other seminary, induced the examiners—among whom were at this time numbered the Right Reverend Vicar Apostolic, and Dr. Olliffe—to devote a longer period to them, than to other branches of study: the 19th Chapter of Telamaque was therefore selected as not having been before read by the boys; but though at sight, yet they evinced no hesitation, and effected the translation and explanation of its grammatical formation in a manner highly creditable to their instructors, who, we doubt not, experienced much gratification at the eminent success of their labors. After this, they translated into French a passage selected at hazard from a book that was laying on the table. The second class then, under the examination of the Right Reverend Vicar Apostolic, Dr. Olliffe, and the Reverend Mr. Mascarenhas, translated part of the tenth Chapter of Matthew, from Greek into English, and several selections from the first and second books of Cæsar's commentaries into French and English, explaining also the grammatical concordances of them. After this, a youth of the first class, in Algebra, explained and illustrated Newton's binomial theory, to the satisfaction of the examiner, Mr. Middleton, of the Hindoo College. This was followed by a spirited discussion between four of the students on the merits of a merely scientific, as it is called, and a classical education;—after which, the visitors were politely invited to partake of a collation in the refectory, and on returning to the Theatre, a sufficiently extensive distribution of prizes was made by the Right Reverend Vicar Apostolic to such boys as had distinguished themselves at four private quarterly examinations; and the names of such as had deserved praise, short of the meritorious distinction of a prize, were honorably announced. The whole concluded with an Apostolic benediction in the Chapel of the Institution, where was exhibited a very beautiful new altar-piece, a present, we learn, from Monsieur Brazier, attracting much admiration. We will not attempt to sound the praises of this excellent seminary, for if we did so, with reference to the state of other institutions, our language would abound too much with superlatives. Its own progress, therefore, we will leave to speak its merits. From an obscure and almost unknown school, it has, in a few years, reached its present eminence, and may be said to form now a new æra in education in India, since there is no seminary here, save the exclusive one of the Bishop's College, that even attempts to give, what is properly called, a classical education. The whole appearance, and systematic order of the School, brought back in more livid colours than any other examination, and we have witnessed

most in this city, the happy days of our youth, when we too aspired to the distinguished praise of our teachers and superiors. Yet, even delighted as we were by this exhibition, we shall look forward with greater promise to another year when the newly introduced system may have had sufficient time to display itself fully, and not be limited, as it was, this year, to the short period of two months,—that being all that has been yet allowed it since the late accession of instructors. We cannot close without observing on two of the Prizes given that bore the impress of the eminent Seminary of Stoneyhurst in Lancashire, nor without impressing on the mind of our Catholic friends the thankfulness they ought to feel at having such an institution within their reach, and bringing to their own doors, as it were, that superiority of education only attainable hitherto by a long and painful separation from the objects of their love and care, too often ending in the severing those ties of affection, which are so dear to a christian and a parent.

THE CATHOLIC CHARITY SCHOOLS.

We were present on Thursday last, at the annual Examination of the pupils attached to the Catholic Free Schools, and were much delighted at the proficiency displayed by them. They were examined by the Reverend Mr. Chadwick, Rector of St. Xavier's College, the Revd. Dr. Olliffe, Mr. Michael Crow, and some other gentlemen, in reading grammar, arithmetic, history and geography of India, Bengally and other branches of useful knowledge, in the presence of the Right Reverend Bishop Taberd and a respectable assemblage of Ladies and Gentlemen. The Principal School, we learn, consists of ninety boys and eighty-five girls, and the branch school, situated in Bow Bazar, of one hundred and sixteen boys and forty girls, numbering in all 331 Children. We understand that previous to the examination upwards of 200 Suits of clothes were distributed to the most indigent of the Children, and at the close of the day's business, silver medals and Books were awarded as Prizes to the most deserving of the pupils.

It is cheering to record that with the slender means they have at their command, the Committee have succeeded in effecting so much real good as they have done. By their disinterested zeal and unwearied exertions in promoting the welfare of so many poor and helpless children, they have richly merited the sincere and warm thanks of every Christian philanthropist.

The Reverend Dr. Olliffe read a report of the Committee, which we hope to lay before our readers in our next number, when we may revert to the subject.

PROPAGATION OF THE FAITH.

This pious work is progressing. The parent tree has but lately pushed forth a branch into this distant land, and has begun to extend its growth, and to ripen into fruit. In the account of its present state, which we publish, the friends and members of the institution will be glad to see much, that

will fan their kindling hopes, that gives sure augury of great success. And the more so, as, generally, its introduction has been strenuously opposed in every other country ; no opposition has been encountered, nor is apprehended, here. The number of Decades has swelled up to seventy-nine : of these, Calcutta owns forty-two ; Dum-Dum, twenty ; and Fort William, seventeen. The contributions *already sent in* amount to three hundred and eighty-one rupees eight annas. And the institution has existed hardly three weeks among us, and has not yet extended, Hazarebaugh excepted, beyond one place. We had promised ourselves the pleasure of inserting the name of Chinsurah ; but up to this period no communication has been received from that very Catholick depôt. What are the good folks about there ? If there is only a single man amongst them, who can feel willing to make a beginning, and can engage nine associates in one decade, let him write instantly up to the Secretary, F. Pereira Esq. at Gilmore and Co.'s Office, and he shall be sure to receive instructions, which will soon multiply his decade into some hundreds ; and inform him how to arrange his accounts, and to transmit their sums to their destination. The good Catholics of Fort William have been fired with emulation of the example of their brethren at Dum-Dum, and one effort has made them represent a hundred and seventy names in the list of members. Chinsurah must burn next. Advantage was had of the last Overland Mail to transmit to England the full notice of its establishment in Calcutta, and of all the particulars required. By the same opportunity, the proper number of the Annals were claimed. For the convenience of the Collectors of 10, and of 100, printed forms of the accounts to be kept by them, have been struck off : these may be had on application to the Secretary, or at St. Xavier's College ; they will be forwarded as they shall be wanted, to the country.

We are happy to learn, that the Right Rev. Monsignore Borghi, Bishop of Bethsaida, Coadjutor and Successor to the Vicar Apostolic of Agra, arrived at his destination on the 29th ultimo. His Lordship is said to be acquainted with the English language, and a person of no ordinary acquirements, as well as of superior virtue.

Selections.

ST. XAVIER'S COLLEGE.

We were present yesterday at the examination of the pupils of St. Xavier's College, and were certainly much gratified with the creditable way in which most of them acquitted themselves in replying to the questions which were put. From what we noticed, we are convinced the system of instruction must be good, and nothing confirms us so strongly in our opinion as the great increase of scholars and general prosperity of the establishment, which would not be the case unless the parents received every satisfaction. Several of the pupils came forward and delivered an address or oration, and it is but fair to say that some evinced a proficiency in elocution much above what might have been expected. Altogether we feel assured the parents must have been highly pleased as we were ourselves, and we only hope the establishment may continue to increase and succeed as it is now certainly doing.—*Englishman.*

CURIOSITIES OF LITERATURE BEFORE THE REFORMATION, No. IV.

DESTRUCTION OF THE MSS.

In our last article we examined the claims of the Protestant Church to the title of patron of literature, and we showed what share the worthies of the pseudo-Reformation had in the destruction of ancient MSS.: other causes of this destruction, and the claims of the monks to the gratitude of posterity as the encouragers of letters, will now be discussed. On the continent, the irruption of those northern hordes that destroyed the Roman empire in the west; in England, the devastations of the Danes must be considered as the greatest scourges of literature and civilization. Accustomed to reverence the monasteries as the sanctuaries of religion, the people, on the approach of the enemy, deposited within them their most valuable effects, and then rallied round to defend them from the attacks of the barbarians. But nothing could withstand their fury. They burst through all opposition, massacred the inmates, ransacked every corner for plunder, raking even among the tombs for the gold and silver which our ancestors were accustomed to bury with the dead. Then, to put a finishing stroke to the work of devastation, they devoted the building to the flames. In this manner perished many valuable works: years elapsed before the libraries could be restored, and many works were irrecoverably lost.

The great Alexandrian library one of the finest in the world, was destroyed by Omar, calif of the Saracens or followers of Mahomet, in the year 642. It was founded by Ptolemy Soter: at the death of his son Philadelphus,* it contained 100,000 volumes. By the succeeding princes of that race it was enlarged still more, till at last it consisted of 700,000 vols: of these 300,000 were contained in the serapion or temple of Serapis: 400,000 in that part of Alexandria called Bruchion. In Cæsar's war with Alexandria, the library of Bruchion, with its 400,000 volumes, was consumed. The loss, however, was amply retrieved, and it was rendered still more numerous and considerable than before: Cleopatra enriched it with 200,000 vols. which were presented to her by Antony from the library of Pergamus. The answer of Omar, when consulted by his general Amri Ebnal As (ass?) regarding the disposal of the books, is a good sample of Saracenic logic. 'If,' said he, 'they contain the same doctrine as the Khoran, they are useless, for the Khoran is sufficient in itself; if they contain any thing contrary to that book, they ought to be destroyed.' In consequence of this barbarous answer, they were distributed among the public baths; where, for the space of six months, they were used for fuel instead of wood. While our readers condemn the Saracen, they must not forget the complaint of John Bole to our modern Omar, Edward VI., and the consignment of splendidly illuminated MSS. to supply the jakes. One lived in the seventh the other in the sixteenth century: whether was the greater barbarian? the Protestant Edward, or the Mahometan Omar?

Amongst the Romans, the libraries were generally attached to the temples of their gods, as, during the middle ages, they were attached to the mon-

* All Greek and other books that were brought into Egypt were seized and transcribed: the copies were then given to the proprietors, and the originals were deposited in the library. Ptolemy Evergetes got from the Athenians the originals of Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, returning them only copies, and giving them upwards of 3,000*l.* in exchange. Ptolemy Philadelphus is generally represented as having got the Bible translated from Hebrew into Greek. The version was called the Septuagint, from its being supposed to be the work of 70 or 72 Jews, who were confined in separate cells, and all of whose translation agreed with each other when compared; but this is now exploded as the invention of a latter age.

asteries. That they should occasionally be destroyed when the zeal of the early Christians prompted them to set fire to the Pagan temples: there can be no doubt, but that they were ever wilfully set on fire, or that they perished to the extent that some writers, the sworn foes of Christianity, would have us believe, it would be folly for a moment to suppose. When accident or the execrable wickedness of Nero wrapt Rome in flames,—a fire the worst, the most violent, and destructive that ever befel that city,—numberless temples and palaces were destroyed. ‘And with these,’ says Tacitus, ‘were consumed the trophies of so many victories, the inimitable works of the Grecian artists, with the precious monuments of literature and ancient genius; all at present remembered by men advanced in years, but irrecoverably lost.’ When we consider that at this period the copies of works were few, so that two great contemporary writers were unknown to each other; and that they were chiefly confined within the walls of Rome, some notion may be formed of the extent of the loss sustained by this and succeeding conflagrations. Domitian subsequently restored the Palatine library, but it suffered a second time by the flames: and the extensive library of the capitol perished in a fire during the reign of Commodus. No pen can adequately describe the wreck of libraries and books during the successive devastations of Alaric, Genseric, and Attila. We leave it to the burning indignation of our readers, when rising chafed and mortified from the perusal of Tacitus or Livy, from whose works whole books have perished, to record the loss.

In 1453, when the Turks, under Mahomet the Great, took Constantinople, 120,000 volumes were destroyed. In England, during the turbulent reign of King Stephen, the library of York, which had been founded by Archbishop Egbert, perished by the flames. That diffuser of prejudice and error, the ‘Useful Knowledge Propagation Society,’ has the hardihood to insinuate, we might say to assert, in their life of Caxton, that St. Gregory the Great burnt the library of Mount Palatine. Even many Protestants have now ceased to repeat the oft refuted calumny. The Palatine library must have perished long before the time of St. Gregory. The only authority for this tale is John of Salisbury, who lived about 600 years after St. Gregory, and who mentions it merely as an *on dit*, a flying report. How can any writer, laying claim to honesty, have the face to publish such an assertion, grounded on a mere hearsay, recorded by a writer who lived *six hundred years* after the supposed fact took place? In the invasion of Italy by the Lombards, their fury extended to objects which their rude predecessors had generally respected; and learning was now attacked in her most vulnerable parts. Amid the general destruction, the monasteries and their libraries were no longer spared: and with others, that of Monte Casino, one of the most valuable and extensive in Italy, was plundered by them. This monastery was founded by Cassiodorus, a man of great learning and virtue. After pre-eminent services as a minister of state during the reign of Theodoric, and regency of Amalasuntha, he retired, in the year 540, at the age of 70, to this monastery, situated near the place of his birth, in Calabria, in the south of Italy. In a work ‘*de Orthographia*,’ he gives minute directions for copying manuscripts with facility and correctness. Thus, in collecting an ample library—in diffusing copies of ancient MSS.—in verbal instructions, written lectures, and the composition of voluminous works,—he closed, in the service of religion and learning, a long and meritorious life.

We now come to the examination of the gravest charge against the monks—their effacing ancient classics to supply their place with some inferior work. This accusation has gained strength since the discovery of a fragment of the ‘*de Republica*’ of Cicero, by Angelo Mai, Librarian of the Vatican. This treatise had been effaced by some chemical process, and in its place had been substituted a commentary of St. Augustine. On the announcement of this fact, the war-whoop was raised against the poor monks, who were described as men of wretched taste, hostile to classical learning. Let us examine this charge. To the monks the treatise of St. Augustine would be

of much more value than that of Cicero: they had a right, therefore, to consult their own interest by expunging the tract of the Heathen, and by supplying its place with that of the Christian. Which of our Bibliopoliſts would decline the more lucrative job of printing Sir Walter Scott's novels to commence the reissue of Cicero's works? Of what use was the pearl to the cock, in comparison with the grain of corn? Yet let it not be supposed that we would exalt Cicero above St. Augustine; for, Latinity expected, we know not who would not prefer a work by the biſhop of Hippo to the moſt finiſhed production of the Roman orator.

Independent of the monks ſuppoſing that they were ſubſtituting a work of incomparably more value, they would never for a moment ſuppoſe that other copies of it would not deſcend to poſterity: otherwiſe they would never have erased it; for we know that Lupus, abbot of Ferriers, a monaſtery in the Orleanois, wrote to Pope Benedict III. to requeſt the loan of Cicero 'de Oratore' and 'Quintilin.' St. Hugo VI., abbot of Clunny, uſed to ſleep with the works of Virgil under his pillow. Boaſtful as are our modern *literati*, we ſhould like to know which of them would heſitate to ſend a quarto of Cicero to their 'jakes,' whiſt a traſhy novel of the bigot Scott was baſking in red morocco and gilt leaves on their drawing room table? The reſtorers of letters, as they are called, did not accuſe the monks of neglecting the classics; for it was to their ſelves that they always applied. It is true, they ſpeak of dark corners, damp cheſts, and iron clasp; but it was only to give an importance to their own activity: like hunters, they often exaggerated their difficulties. But even ſuppoſing that a copy of Tacitus was found at the bottom of an old cheſt in the monaſtery of St. Gall, that does not inculpate the whole body of monks: it is wretched logic to draw a general ſweeping concluſion from one inſolated fact. The work might have been miſlaid; it might have been deposited there for ſafety, for too great care often proves as prejudicial as too much neglect; it might perhaps be in a ſtate of *banishment*, for Lupus, abbot of Ferriers, thought of baniſhing a work, the loan of which had often been requeſted of him; and we know that Tacitus was always a very ſcarce author. 'Faſt ſhut and with great care the library of ſacred books is to be preſerved,' ſays Thomas à Kempis, 'from all deſilement of duſt, from fire and from damp, from thieves and from the ſound of clamour, from clay off the feet and the corroſion of worms, from all ſtain and rent of leaves.'

Of ſcarcity of materials we need ſay nothing, for our readers will have ſeen how that operated to the diſadvantage of letters; in fact, it was this that cauſed the monks to cancel one MS. to make way for another. Again, it is a known fact, that ſome works were loſt immediately on their publication, as ſome of Vano's diſperſed by Antony. The practice too of abridging works cauſed the originals to be neglected and loſt. In fact, conſidering all the casualties to which books have been expoſed from ancient and modern Vandalism, from the ravages of barbarians, and the intemperate avarice of the miniſters of the little Saracen, Edward VI., it is the multitude and not the fewneſs of MSS. that ought to excite our wonder. Were all the MSS. to be numbered in our public libraries,* and in the cabinets of the curious, we opine that their multitude would aſtound many who now rail at monkish ignorance and idleneſs. Poor dupes!

Mount Pleaſant.

SAGITTARIUS.

* The Royal Library at Paris contains 76,000 MSS. The Bodleian, Oxford 30,000, The Royal Central, Munich, 9,000. The Vatican Rome, 40,000. The University, Gottingen, 5,000. It would be uſeleſs to load our page with more examples. At the French revolution thouſands on thouſands periſhed. They were plundered from the libraries, and heaped, in the churches, in piles reaching from that floor to the ceiling. For a mere political and commercial trick in 1809, a ſhipload, of books and MSS., were exported with the expreſs purpoſe of being caſt into the ſea in order, that the ſhip might take in Coffee and Sugar in their place.

PRETENDED CHANGE FROM PROTESTANCY TO POPERY.
LETTER IV.

To the Lord Bishop of Exeter.

MY LORD BISHOP,—No man of any education can be so ignorant as not to know with what difficulty and opposition the second change called the Reformation was begun, carried on, and at last effected. Innumerable histories are filled with the most ample relations of the obstinate and bloody wars it occasioned in Germany, France, the Low Countries, and other kingdoms and states. They all tell us with what vigour it was opposed by Leo the 10th. and the following Popes, by the Emperor Charles the 5th, Francis the 1st. of France and his successors, and even by Henry the 8th., under whom great numbers suffered in Smithfield for that cause. Finally, The History of the Council of Trent, in which it was condemned is known by all men of learning, so that no person can doubt of the truth of a fact so well particularised and substantiated in all histories written upon that subject. Now then, my Lord Bishop, I think, I may justly demand of your Lordship the same satisfactory accounts of the first supposed change from Protestancy to Popery, for since they were always equally opposite, and the same causes produce naturally the same effects, no rational man will ever be made to believe, that a change from Popery to Protestancy in a few kingdoms only should occasion such a number of remarkable events, cause so many bloody wars, such disturbances in the church, and revolutions in the state, and that an entire change from Protestancy to Popery should not be attended with any of the like effects. I call, therefore, on your Lordship, as a Protestant Bishop, to furnish Catholics with some tolerable account of the particular circumstances of this change. As who were the principle actors in it! In what age it happened? Whether it came on by degrees or all at once? If all at once, then we must either suppose that the whole Christian world went to bed Protestants and rose Papists, or that a formidable body of Papists, like Cadmus's armed men, rose out of the ground and in a trice cut the throats of all the true Protestants in the world; or, finally, that Popery dropt from the heavens, and got full possession of the universal church without being perceived by any one, till the clear sighted Martin Luther made the happy discovery; for truly I can think of no other way to render it possible that it should get admittance all at once, or without opposition, noise, or trouble. If Popery came in by degrees, it got footing first in one place, then in another, as the Reformation did in Germany, Switzerland, and Geneva, before it crossed the seas to visit England; so that we must suppose there were Protestant and Popish states and kingdoms for some time in former ages, as there have been ever since the Reformation. I ask then, my Lord Bishop, where it was that Popery made its first entrance? Was it in the east or west, south or north? What kingdom, state, or nation abjured the Protestant religion first? Who was the first Bishop of Rome, emperor or king? What Protestant and Popish kings were contemporary? What wars happened in their several reigns about religion? What Protestant councils were called to condemn it? And lastly, by what name were those who adhered to the ancient Protestant religion distinguished from the other who embraced Popery? For I am sensible, my Lord Bishop, that Protestants and Papists are names invented since the Reformation. And, since it is highly improbable that two such different communions, or religions, as those of the Reformation and Church of Rome should be at any time in the world without names to distinguish them, because even the most inconsiderable sect never wanted a name, I should be glad to know what their names were in former ages, viz., from the time that Popery first got footing in some particular state or kingdom till its first establishment in the visible universal Church. I could ask you, my Lord Bishop, many more, puzzling, questions, but I shall be satisfied if your Lordship can

but answer the very few I have put, and produce unquestionable authority for proof of their answers, as Papists can do to prove every material circumstance of the Reformation, and as both Catholics and Protestants can do in reference to any considerable heresy that ever was broached in the church. But if Protestants can give no tolerable account of the forementioned particulars, as I am sure they must be conscious that they cannot—if there never was an historian in the world that wrote the history of the wonderful change from Protestantism to Popery, under whatever names you please, as there are hundreds who have written the history of the Reformation,—then, my Lord Bishop, it is reasonable to conclude, that the supposed change is a mere fiction, and that any nonsensical tale has full as good a foundation. I doubt not, however, but by the art of invention some ingenious hypothesis may be made—an imaginary scheme may be formed to show the metaphysical possibility of a thing that never has happened, nor never will happen. But this way will not do. I demand, not the invention of a fruitful brain, but plain facts and good history to prove them; nothing less will satisfy me, nor indeed any man who is not fond of being deceived. I desire to know the true history of Popery. I do not mean that Popery which was established every where upon the ruins of Paganism, but of that Popery which we suppose to be the younger sister of Protestantism. I desire to know when and where this unfortunate babe, so hated and persecuted by the best natured people in Europe, was born—where she was nursed—who were her parents and masters—what memorable adventures she met with when she made her first appearance—by what trick or sleight of hand she got the inheritance from Protestantism, her supposed eldest sister, nay, and maintained the full possession of it for many hundred years—in a word, how she came to be mistress of the whole Christian world. These are most material points, for which I demand authentic history, and, till I have some good account of them, I shall continue with a very safe and easy conscience in my belief that the religion which is now called Popery is the true religion, and that it never had any other beginning than what Christ and his apostles gave it. You cannot deny, my Lord Bishop, that Popery was most certainly in possession of the Universal Church for many hundred years. Some account then must be given how it came to be established, since it is a thing without example that any nation ever parted tamely with its ancient religion. If Popery was an intruder upon the ancient Church, how could it find means to establish itself without opposition, whilst men were in their right senses? And if it met with opposition, this would have caused disturbances and schisms, and these disturbances would have been recorded by the historians of the times in which they happened. Now here the difficulty begins to pinch, because no history can be produced of any disturbances or schisms in the Church occasioned by any man's teaching the discriminating doctrines of Popery; whereas, on the contrary, there never was a doctrine opposite to any branch of Popery started in the Church, but it met with a vigorous resistance in its very birth, and caused disorders which are related by historians; as that of Berengarius, Wycliffe, John Huss, the Waldenses, and others. In order, therefore, to make Popery (though pretended to be a doctrine opposite to the ancient faith) come in without noise or resistance, Protestants have no other expedient to bring about this wonderful event than to assert boldly that Christendom was under a general infatuation for many hundred years together, and so make Popery steal its way into the Church unperceived and unopposed, in the midst of a thick darkness of universal ignorance and stupidity. But, my Lord Bishop, the thickest darkness cannot hide the extravagance of this fable. There are a number of historical facts which flatly give it the lie. As first, the many learned universities which flourished in those ages of Protestant pretended darkness, among which that of Paris, founded by Charlemagne, and that of Oxford, founded by King Alfred, were most famous. Secondly, the great number of ecclesiastical writers whereof Bellarmine de Scripturis Ecclesiasticis, re-

kons up two or three hundred in those very ages, and many of these were as eminent both for holiness and learning as any of the ancient writers. Besides innumerable provincial and national synods, there were about ten general councils held between the ninth and sixteenth centuries, and some of them were more numerous than any that had been held before. Nor did they meet in cellars under ground, but in the face of the Universal Church, attentive to every thing that was transacted in those august assemblies; nay, the histories of them are faithfully transmitted to us, without any mention of the least change made in the ancient faith of the church. Fourthly, the long and warm disputes between the Emperors and Popes concerning the privilege of investitures which lasted some ages, and show that the Popes were not arbitrary lords and masters, nor lead all Christendom by the nose; and lastly, (to omit many more historical facts for brevity's sake) the Greek schism, which began in the ninth century, and was not ended till the council of Florence A. D. 1437, during which time, if the Popes had made any false steps, the sharp-sighted Greeks, who were continually on the watch to lay hold of any advantage against the Latins, would without doubt have reproached them with it, since they even accused them of shaving their beards, eating hogs flesh, and many other trivial matters. These are, my Lord Bishop, demonstrative proofs that Christendom was neither so stupidly ignorant as to be unable to discover absurd and monstrous innovations from the ancient doctrine, nor so foolishly passive as to submit tamely to any yoke the Popes should lay upon them, so that I conclude, this Protestant system is a flat contradiction to history, and to common sense. But some perhaps will say it is improbable that any man should attempt to reform the faith of a church, unless he were sure that some great errors had crept into it. I answer, that this, if it were true, would be a good apology for Arius, Socinus and other such reformers. But St. Paul was of a different opinion, for he tells us expressly, Cor. xi. v. 19., 'that there must be heresies; that they who are approved may be made manifest.' In my next letter I shall consider the character of the first Reformer of Popery, and judge from it whether the children of the Reformation have any just reason to glory in such a *Father*.

I am, My Lord Bishop,
Your obedient Servant,
VERAX,
A Catholic Layman.

April 23rd, 1838.

Answers of THE VICARS APOSTOLIC of INDIA to the circular addressed to them by the RIGHT REVD. DR. O'CONNOR, Vicar Apostolic of Madras and Meliapore

The following is a copy of a Letter, written by the very Revd. Father P. Bertrand, S. J. Superior of the Mission of Madura, on the subject of the Schism in India, and which he transmitted to Dr. O'Connor, as a reply to his Letter of the 4th May last.

SIR, I have the honour to forward to your address certain declarations relative to the question now pending between his Lordship Dr. D. O'Connor and the Priests of Goa, or rather between Catholicism and Schism. Without further preamble, I will proceed to speak, first, of the authenticity and authority of the Bull 'Multa Præclare,' (24 April, 1838); secondly, of its consequences in favor of his Lordship D. D. O'Connor, and against the Priests of Meliapore; thirdly, of the Privilege of Patronage.

The authenticity of the Bull 'Multa Præclare,' attested, at the time of its publication, by the letters of Rome which accompanied it, and which were directed, by virtue of right, to all the Catholic Bishops of India, confirmed by the European Journals which announced this new measure adopted by His

Holiness the Pope, and established still more recently by the copy of this Bull forwarded to his Lordship D. D. O'Connor with all the attestations which the most rigorous critic can demand . . . this authenticity, I say, is a fact too evident to require further proof—I appeal in this matter to every honorable man—I appeal to the Magistrates themselves.

As for its authority, I grant that the Magistrates, cannot, according to their religious principles, find, in the decrees of His Holiness the Pope, any law for themselves; I think nevertheless that these decrees may sometimes serve as a rule for their conduct. To explain this.

The Presidency of Madras contains many hundreds of thousands of Christians, who regard obedience to the Supreme Chief of the Catholic Church as the essential and vital principle of their Religion; with all these Christians the Brief '*Multa Præclare*' has supreme and irrefragable authority; hence I conclude that in the present question, it should have the same authority, in the Tribunals, with the Judges and Magistrates. In fact, 1st: the judges cannot come to an equitable conclusion, unless they base their judgments on the rights of the adverse parties, and it is evident that among Catholics an individual can only have a right to the administration of a Church by his lawful mission, by the authority of His Holiness the Pope.

2ndly. Magistrates consider it a sacred duty to procure the peace and happiness of the people, by affording to every one liberty to live in the exercise and according to the principles of his religion; now all Catholics ought to look upon, and do actually look upon the priests who rebel against the Bull '*Multa Præclare*' as men of another Religion, with whom they do not wish to hold, nor can they conscientiously hold any communication in religious matters. Then it behoves the justice and wisdom of the Magistrates not to force such Priests upon a Catholic population; which would certainly be the case, if these Priests were maintained in possession of the Churches, to which those people are wont and have a right to resort for the practise of the duties of their Religion.

110. The necessary consequence of this first article is that I (and with me all the Priests, who act under my direction,) acknowledge His Lordship, the most Illustrious D. D. O'Connor, to the exclusion of every other, and in virtue of the Brief '*Multa Præclare*,' to be the only Vicar Apostolic and Ordinary of the Roman Catholic Church of Madras and Meliapore, to whom alone belong, lawfully and canonically, the care and all the rights, both spiritual and temporal, of that Church.

And that at the same time, all Priests and Lay persons, who dare to resist his authority, and to impede him in the administration of the spiritual and temporal concerns of the Churches committed to his care, incur the guilt of rebellion against the Supreme Chief of the Roman Catholic Church, have broken the essential bond of Catholicism, are consequently Schismatics separated from the communion of the Catholic Church, and ought to be treated as such.

III0. And this notwithstanding the false reasoning, which these Schismatics may draw from the Right of Patronage, and from the pretended Concordats between the Sovereign Pontiffs and the Kings of Portugal. In fact,

1st. It is a principle admitted by all Canonists, that in matters which regard the Discipline and Government of the Catholic Church, his Holiness the Pope, cannot, by any decree tie up rigorously the hands of his successors, because these successors have an authority equal to his, and the first and indispensable duty of each Sovereign Pontiff is to procure the good of the faithful by those measures which the circumstances require. Then, when granting the Privilege of Patronage, the Sovereign Pontiffs never intended neither were they able, to despoil themselves of the sacred and inalienable right of supplying the wants of Religion according to the exigencies of the times, and this declaration is expressly contained in the Bull '*Multa Præclare*.'

20. Even if we view the Privilege as a rigorous contract, this contract has been long since annulled. Here is the proof. It is a principle of natural and civil right, that every contract ceases, when the nature of things is so changed, that the principal reason and motive of the contract no longer exists, and that the essential conditions of the contract become impossible. This being laid down, it is certain, that the reason of the Privilege was the power of the King of Portugal in India, and consequently the facility he had of protecting Christianity and of succouring its Ministers, and this was also the express condition of the Privilege. Now, at the present day, the Queen of Portugal not only does not possess a spot of earth in these countries, but, further, the English Company, cannot, according to the principles of a wise Government, permit that a strange Sovereign should exercise her influence in this country, even under the pretext of Religion, and the Government has clearly manifested this principle in its decree of 1836, relative to this matter. In consequence of all this, the essential reason, on which the Privilege of Patronage was grounded, no longer exists, and the condition under which it was granted has become impossible; the Privilege, therefore, even when it is viewed as a rigorous contract, has no longer any obligatory force.

30. Finally, there is another reason which, of itself, is sufficient to destroy all the pretensions founded on the Privilege of Patronage. All Lawyers agree in admitting that a contract is annulled when one of the contracting parties fails therein, refuses, or neglects to accomplish the conditions set down in the contract; now the conditions of the Privilege were that the Kings of Portugal should provide for the prompt nomination and due support of the Bishops, should protect Christianity, &c. And it is a public fact, that for a great number of years past, the greater number of the Bishopricks in India are without Bishops, (that for 39 years the Bishoprick of Meliapore has no confirmed Bishop) that for a very long time the Kings of Portugal have neglected the care of the Churches of India. It is also a public fact that the actual Queen of Portugal, far from providing for the wants of Religion in India, has despoiled the Churches of Goa as she had those of Portugal. It is a fact known to all Europe, that the Queen has openly declared in revolt against the Chief of the Church, has expelled ignominiously his Nuncio or Representative, and has forbidden to her subjects all communication with the Holy See.

From all these facts, it evidently follows, and with an evidence clearer than day, that the Kings and the Queen of Portugal have themselves destroyed all the contracts which existed between them and His Holiness the Pope, have renounced all the rights they had, and of which the Schismatics of Meliapore boast in public, when they still speak of their pretended Privilege.

These, Sir, are the declarations, which I proposed to submit to you, relative to the cause of his Lordship the most Illustrious D. D. O'Connor, against the priests of Goa.

It only remains for me to offer to you the sentiments of consideration and respect, with which, without having the honour of your acquaintance, I beg to subscribe myself,

Sir,

Your most humble and obt. Servt.

P. BERTRAND.

Superior of the Mission of Madura.

Calliditidel, 3rd June, 1839.

Questions proposed by the Right Revd. Dr. O'Connor, V. A. of M. and M. to the most Revd. Basilio Altarian D. D. of Mount Libanus, and Archprelate of the Church of Antab and Kilies, with the answers received from the said Most Revd. Prelate.

QUESTIONS.

1st.—In the Catholic Armenian Church, can any Priest who may be nominated or elected by the Civil Supreme Authority, or by the Clergy of a Vacant See, as successor to a deceased Bishop, enter on the exercise of all the Episcopal Functions, or of any of them, before he is approved of and confirmed by the Pope?

2nd.—Were any Priest to enter on the exercise of the Episcopal office, before he was approved of by the Pope, what opinion would the Roman Catholic Armenian Church form of his conduct? Would the Clergy and people of the Vacant Diocese be not only at liberty to refuse obedience to him, but even bound not to acknowledge his authority or hold communion with him, in spiritual matters?

3rd.—Does the Catholic Armenian Church recognize in the Pope the right of erecting new dioceses, and of suppressing dioceses formerly erected?

4th.—Supposing that the Supreme Temporal Authority acknowledged by the Armenians, has, by compact with the Pope, the right to nominate to the vacant Sees in their Church, if a misunderstanding or difference were to arise between the aforesaid Supreme Temporal Authority and the Pope, and if the Pope refuses to approve or confirm a Clergyman nominated by the temporal Authority to a vacant Bishoprick, would the Catholic Armenians be bound by their religious principles not to receive as Bishop the Clergyman whom the Pope refuses thus to confirm?

5th.—Has a Priest, who, by disobedience to the Chief Pastor of the Roman Catholic Church, in refusing to acknowledge the Bishop or Vicar Apostolic appointed over him by the Pope, incurs the guilt of Schism, has such a Priest authority to administer Sacraments? Is he not guilty of grievous Sacrilege every time that he attempts to celebrate Mass or to administer a Sacrament?

ANSWERS.

1st.—A Priest not approved of, or whose election or nomination is not confirmed by the Holy See, cannot, according to the Catholic Armenian Church, enter on the exercise of any Episcopal function or authority.

2nd.—Were a Priest presumptuously to enter on the exercise of the Episcopal office, before he was lawfully appointed by the Pope, he would incur the censure of suspension, be placed out of the communion of the Church, and the Clergy and Laity would be bound to withdraw from any spiritual communion with him.

3rd.—The Roman Catholic Armenian Church recognizes in the Pope the right of erecting new dioceses, and of suppressing dioceses, formerly erected, when he judges that there is a just cause for doing so,

4th.—The Pope, being the Supreme Authority in Ecclesiastical matters, is not bound to submit to any Civil or Temporal Authority in such matters, and the Catholic Armenians, are bound to follow the decision of the Pope, and not recognize any person as Bishop, unless that person be approved and confirmed by the Roman Pontiff.

5th.—A Priest that refuses to acknowledge the Prelate appointed over him by the Pope, incurs the guilt of Schism, and commits Sacrilege by celebrating Mass, or administering any Sacrament.

6th.—Is it not a universally received principal of Catholic Moral Theology, that a Parent or other Superior is entitled to the obedience of a child or inferior, even when the child or inferior doubts whether the Parent or Superior have a right to enjoin or command the performance of the action concerning which the doubt is entertained by the child or Inferior?

7th.—Is not a Roman Catholic bound to regulate his conduct by the same rule, should the Pope enact any ordinance, concerning the obligation of which he, the Catholic, might possibly entertain a doubt?

6th.—The child or Inferior in the proposed case is bound, under sin, to obey his Parent or Superior.

7th.—In a similar case of doubt, the Roman Catholic is bound to follow the rule laid down in the preceding answer, and obey the decision of the Chief Pastor of the Roman Catholic Church.

BASILIO ATTARIAN, D. D. OF MOUNT LIBANUS,

Arch-Prelate of the Churches of Antab and Kelis &c. &c.

We the undersigned testify, that the seven preceding Questions were proposed at the instance of the Right Revd. Dr. O'Connor, to the most Revd. Basilio Attarian D. D. of Mount Libanus, Arch-Prelate of the Churches of Antab and Kelis and that the Answer annexed to each of these Questions was returned by the said Most Revd. Basilio Attarian D. D. &c. &c.

G. J. USUNIAN.

I. B. USUNIAN.

Madras, 30th July, 1839.

INTELLIGENCE.—It is in contemplation, we understand to build two Roman Catholic Chapels, in St. Helier's, towards which it is said the Right Reverend Dr. Griffiths, Roman Catholic Bishop of Olena, *in partibus* has contributed the very handsome sum of £200 sterling.—*Jersey Times.*

FLOWERS FROM THE HOLY FATHERS.

No. XVI.

Si neque precibus, neque consilio, neque admonitu quidquam proficimus, flere tandem reliquum est.—*Sic. Basilii Or. 42.*

SAY, should entreaties not prevail,
Should words, or earnest counsel fail,
To wake the mind of those who stray
Apart from God, and wisdom's way,
Let not despair athwart thee creep,
Thou mayest retire to God—and weep!

Do friends ye dearly love still drink
The cup of life from error's sink?
Does ignorance or thoughtless pride
Still lead them in the pathway wide?
Although they hear thee not—do thou
Weep on, and God their hearts shall bow

Though to thy words all full and fair
 They hearken not, yet still beware
 Leat ye let slip one word of scorn,
 When haply on another morn,
 Hads't thou the night in weeping spent,*
 Their hearts that night thy God had bent.

Think of the depths of mist and gloom,
 That o'er the face of virtue come,
 When even from very childhood, these
 Are taught to lisp out blasphemies
 Against God's Holy Church, and then,
 For love's sweet sake, weep on again.

Ah! could we lift the veil and see
 How many tears, my God, to thee,
 Rise up in intercessional prayer,
 From humble hearts, for those who err,
 Well might we feel contrition deep,
 Retire apart to pray and weep.

If we but thought how many a soul,
 Unconscious looks to error's dole,
 Who by our prayers and tears might be
 Set from their galling bondage free,
 Well might we weep, and watch and pray,
 Our rest at night, our meat by day!

Come, Christian brother, thou hast been
 From bondage called to peace serene,
 While error o'er the land prevails
 Join before God in tears and wails—
 And souls innumerable shall come,
 Brought by our tears united, home!

Great is the might of littleness—
 Who can set bounds to love's excess?
 Weep for fair England, weep for her
 Whose youthful head the crown doth wear;
 Weep on, and Victory brought back
 Walk *all* again, in God's own track.

* 'The conversion of two celebrated Rabbins,' says Butler, in his life of the angelic doctor, 'seemed a still greater miracle. St. Thomas had held a long conference with them at a casual meeting in Cardinal Richard's villa, and they agreed to resume it the next day. The Saint spent the foregoing night in prayer at the foot of the altar. The next morning these two most obstinate Jews came to him of their own accord, not to dispute, but to embrace the faith, and were followed by many others.'—*Butler's Lives of the Saints, in St. Thomas of Aquino, March 7.*

THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

'One body and one spirit—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.'

NO. XXVI.

DECEMBER 28, 1839.

VOL. I.

CONVERSION OF MRS. KELSALL.

On last Saturday evening, in the Principal Catholic Church of Calcutta, Mrs. Althea Victoria Kelsall made a public renunciation of Protestantism, and a solemn profession of the Catholic Faith. She was admitted into the Church according to the form prescribed in our Ritual, and on the Sunday following, received her first communion from the hands of the Right Reverend the Vicar Apostolic. This lady is a self-convert, and first made known her desire to be admitted into the bosom of the Church to the Reverend Mr. Chadwick, of the College Chapel, who afforded her suitable instructions; which she also received from the Reverend Dr. Olliffe, who administered to her the sacrament of Penance, and she was then conditionally baptized by the Reverend Mr. Mascarenhas, after her abjuration.

It may not be amiss to mention that Mrs. Kelsall for the last three or four years, was a *regular attendant* at the Union (Independent) Chapel at Dhurumtollah, and that she is wholly indebted for her conversion to *The Calcutta Christian Advocate!* Though she had been taught from her childhood to consider that the Catholic religion was of human origin, and its doctrines and discipline grossly superstitious and heathenish; yet her reason was staggered at the daring and calumnious assertions against it, which disgraced the pages of the self-styled *Advocate of Christianity*. She at once resolved to find out the truth, and the result of her anxious search has proved, as it always must, that the Catholic Church is that Church which was established by the Apostles, and which Christ promised to be with, and to lead into all truth to the end of the world.

We could not allow so interesting an occurrence to pass unnoticed in our annals: we cordially congratulate our Catholic brethren upon this accession of a sincere convert; but we beg to offer our warmest congratulations to the subject of this article, and to hope that several others, who are at present wavering, and though convinced, not yet determined, may imitate the delightful example she has set them, and come to Mount Sion, the City of the Living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to the company

of many thousands of angels, and to the Church of the first born, who are written in heaven, and to God, the judge of all, and to the spirits of the just made perfect.'

We regret to state that Mr. Scully of St. Xavier's College, has been obliged to return to Europe on the *Plinthenet* in consequence of the demise of his father.

ABUSE OF THE JESUITS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

'There is a wonderful vigor of constitution in a Popular Fallacy. When the world has once got hold of a lie, it is astonishing how hard it is to get it out of the world ! You beat it about the head until it seems to have given up the Ghost, and the next day it is as healthy as ever.'—*Bulwer*.

SIR,—Whatever difference of opinion there may be as to who is the best abused man in the world, there can, I think, be none, as to the Jesuits being, beyond all comparison, the best abused body of men that ever existed. This may at first excite surprise, but that surprise will cease when we reflect on the fact, that the line of conduct, which this illustrious and meritorious order uniformly pursued, necessarily rendered them objects of hatred and obloquy with all the enemies of the Catholic Church. The Jesuits, as is well known, have always stood forward as the able, zealous and uncompromising champions of the Catholic Faith against the assaults of religious innovators of every description. It is no wonder then that the Reformers, the Jansenists and the Unbelievers conceived a deep animosity against those who so incessantly and so powerfully opposed their erroneous novelties and impieties.

The philosophers aiming at nothing short of the entire overthrow of Christianity, and disbelieving Christ's sacred promise of continued support to his Church, vainly imagined that it would not long survive the downfall of its ablest defenders ; for whose destruction, therefore they united all their energies, and made common cause with all the enemies of the Church. To this end, every vile art and base expedient, that the most refined malice could suggest, was used to inspire a deadly hatred of the Jesuits ; whose zeal for religion was a mortal offence before the tribunal of philosophy. The Institute of St. Ignatius was attacked in every part, and its faithful observers were traduced, vilified and calumniated in every imaginable way. The parliament of Paris sided with the philosophers, by whom it was indeed governed. Its zeal in devoting the society to forfeiture, banishment and disgrace, drew from D'Alembert the following compliment to them :—' *The chambers of the parliaments deal not in Mortmain : they serve the cause of reason without suspicion ; they execute summary justice on behalf of the philosophers, from whom they take heir orders without knowing it. It is philosophy, properly speaking, that has, from the mouths of the parliamentary Magistrates, passed sentence upon the Jesuits, Jansenism was but the solicitor in the cause.*' I rejoice,' says Voltaire, 'with my noble Chevalier (the Marquis de

Villevielle) at the expulsion of the Jesuits. Japan began by driving out those rascals. China followed Japan. France and Spain are imitating the Chinese, *may they exterminate all religious, who are not one jot better than Loyola's scoundrels. Were they to give the Sorbonne their own way, they would be worse than the Jesuits. We are surrounded by monsters: but they do but fire my worthy friend and rouse him to action, and at the same time warn him to conceal his movements from the enemy.'*

The Philosophers were not satisfied with the expulsion of the Jesuits from France, but carried their persecution of them into other countries, especially into Spain and Portugal where they found fit and willing instruments in the ministers Carvalho (Marquis de Pambal), and Count d'Aranda. The former was a declared enemy of the Holy See and of all Bishops, and the avowed abettor of several new doctrines subversive of the ancient faith; and had resolved upon the ruin of the Society on account of the opposition he had encountered from them to the progress of his innovations. And in the attainment of his object, he acknowledged having spent 800,000 ducats, Count d'Aranda, the Spanish minister, had obtained a complete sway over the mind of his monarch, and became, as d'Alembert expresses himself, *'the executive administrator of Supreme justice under philosophy.'* He had confederated himself with the philosophers, and like them, he was bent on the destruction of the Jesuits. The manner in which he accomplished his design may be stated in the words of the historian of Spain and Portugal, (Lardner's Cyclopædia) who being himself a Protestant, cannot be suspected of any partiality towards the Jesuits. After noticing a tumult occasioned among the people by a monopoly of the supply of bread and oil, he observes as follows:—

That this commotion was a political intrigue was no less the conviction of the king than of his ministers; to and his suspicions fell on the Jesuits, and on some of his grandees. The latter were too powerful to be punished: but the poor fathers of Jesus, whose lives, at this time, were not merely innocent, but meritorious, were sacrificed to the machinations of their enemies. Some years preceding, on a charge as destitute of foundation, they had been expelled from Portugal: in 1764, their inveterate foe, the duke de Choiseul, minister of Louis XV., had driven them from France; and, in Spain, their possessions were regarded with an avaricious eye by some of the needy courtiers. To effect their downfall, the French minister eagerly joined with the advocates of plunder: and intrigues were adopted which must cover their authors with everlasting infamy. Not only was the public alarm carefully excited by a report of pretended plots, and the public indignation, by slanderous representations of their persons and principles; but, in the name of the chiefs of the order, letters were forged, which involved the most monstrous doctrines and the most criminal designs. A pretended circular from the general of the order, at Rome, to the provincial, calling on him to join with the insurgents; the deposition of perjured witnesses to prove that the recent commotion was chiefly the work of the body, deeply alarmed Carlos, and drew him into the views of the French cabinet. The decree for their expulsion, addressed to the governors of the provinces, was secretly signed and transmitted; at a given hour of the night their colleges were surrounded by troops; the members of each community were assembled; the decree hastily read to them: a few minutes only was allowed them to collect their breviaries, linen, and a few conveniences; the gates were then closed, and they were hurried, in separate companies, to the carriages which awaited them, conveyed to the coast, and embarked for Italy. With similar precautions, and equal rapidity, were those glaringly unjust orders executed in the capital

and in the provinces. The exiles bore their lot with a fortitude which conscious innocence only could inspire. But the cup of their sufferings was not yet full. The governor of *Civita Vecchia* would not allow them to disembark until the Pope's pleasure was known. Clement refused to admit them, under the plea, that, if they were to be expelled from all the countries of Europe, his dominions would be too narrow to contain them. In the mean time, these venerable sufferers were crowded together in the transports, like the vilest convicts: the more aged and infirm perished, as well from the suffocation as from the want of necessaries. During three months were they the sport of the waves, of the tempests, and of passions still more boisterous. At length they were permitted to land in *Corsica*; were hurried, like so many bales of goods, to the commercial depôts, and there left, without beds or provisions, until the Pope granted the few survivors permission to settle in Italy, and until the king of Spain allowed each a pension of about one shilling a day. This odious persecution was not confined to Spain: it raged at the same time in the most distant colonies—in *Buenos Ayres* and *Paraguay*, as well as in the *Phillippine Islands*.*

In contemplating the actions, the historian must not overlook the passions, of mankind: still less should he suffer the latter to bias his feelings, and, through them, his judgment. If we divest ourselves of prejudice in weighing the conduct and character of the Jesuits; still more, if we contrast them with those of their persecutors, we cannot shut our eyes to the facts, that there lives were, generally, not merely blameless but useful: that they were the victims of a systematic conspiracy, more selfish in its object, and more atrocious in its execution, than any which was ever held up to the execration of mankind. With a refinement of cruelty which we should not have expected from the court of Carlos, they were forbidden even to complain, under the penalty of losing the annual pittance assigned them: nay, the Spaniard who presumed to speak or write in their defence was declared guilty of high treason. But these venerable men were resigned to their fate: so far from uttering one word of complaint, they soothed their irritated flocks, whom they calmly exhorted to obey the civil powers. 'I cannot conclude the just encomium of these men,' says an eye-witness to their expulsion from the *Phillippine Islands*.† 'without observing, that, in a situation where the extreme attachment of the natives to their pastors might, with little encouragement, have given occasion to all the evils of violence and insurrection, I saw them meet the edict for the abolition of their order with the deference due to civil authority, but, at the same time, with a strength and firmness of mind truly manly and heroic.'—But expulsion was not their only misfortune: the abolition of their order was loudly demanded. Clement espoused their cause: in a letter to Carlos, he expatiated on the services they had done to the church; on the injustice of condemning the whole body for the guilt—if guilt there were—of a few; and conjured the monarch, in the name of the whole church, by his tears and old age, not to condemn them unheard. But such appeals, however pathetic and just, were addressed to the winds: they only excited the king to more frequent and earnest applications for the destruction of the order. Two circumstances favored his views; first, the excommunication by the Pope of the duke of Parma, brother of Carlos, for the very same persecution of the Jesuits as had so recently disgraced the courts of France and Spain. If at such powerful monarchs Clement feared to hurl the thunders of the church, he might, he hoped, with impunity vindicate her

* *Sempere, Considération sur les Causes de la Grandeur et de la Décadence de la Monarchie Espagnole*, tom. iii. part. 3. Coxe, *Memoirs*, vol. iii. ch. 64. and 65. Silva, *Deducio Cronologica y Analytica*, passim. This work (3 vols. Lisboa, 1767) is a violent tirade against the order,—one written to gratify courtiers' avarice and revenge. *Histoire des Jésuites et des Missionnaires Péres de la Foi*, tom. ii. Silva, *Historia de Portugal* tom. iv.

† *Pagés, Voyages*, 1—190. (as quoted by Coxe, vol. iii. 331.)

rights against a petty prince bordering on his own dominions. But he was deceived : the two Bourbon kings espoused the cause of the ir weaker brother. not content with resisting the publication of the bull, they had recourse to temporal arms : the one seized Avignon, the other Benevento. Secondly, during the festival of San Carlos, when the king, according to ancient custom, appeared at the balcony of his palace, the assembled multitude, with one voice, demanded the recall of the Jesuits. How he pacified them, we are not told ; but, instead of granting the request, he exiled the archbishop of Toledo, whom he suspected to be the prime author of the petition, and he redoubled his instances at the court of Rome. The aged pontiff, unwilling to comply, yet afraid to refuse, endeavored, by his briefs, to interest other Catholic princes in behalf of his persecuted servants ; when his death deprived them of a protector. The elevation of Ganganelli, under the name of Clement XIV., a prelate of extreme moderation, so far as regarded the pretensions of the Holy See, and one disposed to sacrifice his own wishes in favor of peace, proved that the intrigues of the two Bourbon monarchs had not been inactive. By the new Pope, the brief against the duke of Parma was revoked ; and, ultimately though with exceeding reluctance, the bull of abolition was published. *Thus faction triumphed over innocence, and avarice over the interests of the church.* It is almost needless to add, that, in the present, as in the case of the Templars, and, at a later period, in that of the suppressed monasteries in a country nearer home, a very small portion of the possession so unjustly confiscated was applied to any useful purpose : in Spain, as in England, it found its way into the pockets of a needly sovereign, of courtly minions, or of unprincipled adventurers.*

So great was the dread in which the Jesuits were held by the Apostles of Infidelity that, on a more report that the Society was to be re-established in Portugal, d'Alembert thus expresses himself in a letter to Voltaire : ' I am credibly assured that those Jesuitical miscreants are about to be re-established in Portugal.' — '*The game is up with reason if the enemy gain this great battle.*'

In short the Jesuits have had to reckon among their enemies and persecutors all the religious innovators and anti-christian philosophers of the last three centuries. Persecution always begins by calumniating its intended victims. Consequently an immense fund of calumny has been accumulated, during the last three centuries, against the Sons of Loyola, from which their modern revilers can draw at pleasure ; and thus enjoy the fiendish satisfaction of diffusing falsehoods without being put to the trouble of concocting them. The charges which are repeated in these days to discredit the order being but a repetition of the enormities charged against the society by such characters as TITUS OATES, the JANSEISTS, and the PHILOSOPHERS, in order to render them odious, by covering them with

* Chiefly the same authorities.

The above attempt—one demanded by the sacred interests of justice—to vindicate a persecuted body of men, will not, perhaps, be read with much satisfaction by the Roman Catholics.—the bitterest enemies of the order. A Protestant historian need not, surely, be biassed by the wretched squabbles of men who, however they may differ among themselves, are not the less his religious opponents. But his necessary freedom from such bias must make him the best judge of the subject. Whether the order has not been calumniated ; whether its members are *always* ambitious, or intolerant, or avaricious, or hypocritical, may soon be learned in the neighborhood of Stonyhurst. If charity without ostentation, if piety without fanaticism, if virtues which shrink from the public gaze, are estimable among men, then have the excellent members of that establishment deserved some better reward, at the hands of a late ministry, than that extinction which was absurdly made a condition of the emancipation bill.

infamy and ridicule, and thus prepare the public mind for their persecution. The 'Provincial Letters' cannot be cited as better authority. They were condemned by the Parliament of Province to be publicly burnt '*as being filled with calumnies, falsehoods, suppositions and defamation.*' They were condemned in still stronger terms by the French Hierarchy, and ordered to be publicly burnt by the Council of State. They were also condemned at Rome as heretical and slanderous.

To mention all who esteemed, admired, and befriended the Society of Jesus, would be to mention all who, since the days of St. Ignatius, have been distinguished in the Church for learning, genius and piety. The French Bishops made the most strenuous efforts for the preservation of the order. The following are the terms in which an assembly of fifty prelates addressed the King: '*Sire, in imploring your Majesty at this time (1762) to preserve the Society of Jesus, we present to you the ardent wishes of every ecclesiastical province of your realm. They cannot cast their eyes, without dismay, upon the destruction of a religious order, renowned for the morality of their conduct, the rigour of their discipline, the extent and variety of their lights and their labours, and the numberless services they have rendered both to Church and State.*' Now if the charges that were urged against the Society had had any foundation in truth, it would have been impossible for those prelates not to have known it:—Is it then to be supposed that they would have made such exertions for the preservation of an order whom it would have been their sacred duty to denounce?

Leibnitz, the most learned Protestant of his time, was indignant at the calumnies by which it was attempted to sully the reputation of the Jesuits: '*Confident I am,*' says he '*that they frequently traduce the Society, and fasten upon them opinions and doctrines which they never thought of. It is moreover very certain, that among the members of their Society, there are some of the most valuable and respectable men in being.*' In another place he designates the accusations brought against them, '*impertinent and ridiculous.*' Grotius, another illustrious Protestant writer, calls the Jesuits '*Men of unblemished manners, and good acquirements,*' and he ascribes their influence over men to '*their holiness of life,*' and '*instructing youth in literature, and the precepts of wisdom.*' Dr. Johnson, '*loudly condemned the destruction of the order of Jesuits, as a blow to the general power of the Church, and likely to be followed with many and dangerous innovations, which might at length become fatal to religion itself, and shake even the foundations of Christianity.*' (Life, vol. 6). Will any one believe, that so stern a moralist would have spoken of the destruction of the Jesuits in such terms, if he had attached any credit to the charges alleged against them? The truth sometimes escaped even from Voltaire himself;—In a letter to P  re de la Tour, he writes thus: '*It is impossible to express my astonishment when I hear the Jesuits taxed with teaching a laxity of morals. I dare venture to say, that there is nothing more inconsistent, nothing more unjust, nothing more shameful, than to accuse persons of corrupt morals, who lead the most rigid lives in Europe.*'

'Having arisen,' says Sir James Mackintosh, 'in speaking of the Jesuits in the age of Reformation, they became the chosen champions of the Church against her new enemies. They used some generous and

liberal weapons in their warfare, instead of following the unlettered monks, who decried knowledge as the parent of heresy ; they joined in the general movement of mankind towards polite literature, which they cultivated with splendid success. They were the earliest Reformers of European education. '*For education,*' said Lord Bacon, '*consult the Colleges of the Jesuits. Nothing hitherto tried in practice surpasses them. Education,*' say he, '*has been in some sorts revived in the Colleges of the Jesuits, of whom, in regard to this and other sort of human learning and moral discipline, talis cum sis utinam noster esses,* (being what you are, would you were ours).

On the subject of Education, the Editor of the Dublin Review, who though a Catholic, is not a Jesuit, writes as follows :

Protestantism, in the sixteenth century, was doomed to cope with that mighty adversary, the Church, whose inexhaustible energies and resources had already triumphed over its forerunners, the Albigenses and Vaudois. The Society of Jesus was the day-spring which broke and dispelled the clouds of that dark and tempestuous night, that had gathered about the sanctuary of religion, and was the harbinger of that ever-memorable council, which, like the sun, shed its light over the chaotic elements of conflicting opinions, and served to point out, on the one hand, the deformity of error, and, on the other, the beauty and symmetry of Catholic truth. St. Ignatius, its founder, contemplating, with the deep and philosophic spirit which was peculiar to him, the evils with which social order was infested, like a skilful physician, resolved to apply the remedy at once to the root of the disorder. For, in the neglect into which education in general, and that of the clergy in particular, had fallen, he saw the source to which these evils might be traced, and resolved to repair them, by the revival of those institutions, which had ever been the safeguard of morality. Never was mind bolder, more capacious, more persevering, more intrepid, in facing obstacles, difficulties, and even misfortunes ; and, consequently, none was better qualified for the task he undertook,—to establish the ancient seminaries in their original form, modified according to the wants of the times, and principally with a view of raising, against the adversaries of the Church, a perpetual and insurmountable barrier, which might prevent the farther diffusion of their demoralizing doctrines. As the institution of Ignatius was adopted as the standard, according to which the Council of Trent framed its celebrated decree, an account of the German college, erected not merely at the suggestion, but mainly through the vigorous and but partially supported efforts of that illustrious saint, may not be uninteresting. About the year 1550, he made application, through the Cardinals Morone and Cervini, (afterwards Marcellus II) to Julius III, for his sanction to this design ; into which the Pope entered with such lively ardour and interest, that he determined to have it forthwith carried into execution. The measure was therefore proposed, in a Consistory, at which were present thirty-five cardinals, by the Pope himself ; who described, in strong and glowing terms, the religious and political troubles of Germany, which threatened to overwhelm the rest of Christendom. These were, he observed, ascribable to the degenerate spirit and manners of the clergy ; or, at least, if the disorders among them were repaired by a systematic education, it might reasonably be hoped that the other evils also would speedily be remedied : after which, he unfolded and dilated upon the project of Ignatius, sparing no praise in recommending it. The matter was approved, an annual subscription among the cardinals agreed upon, a proper instrument to this effect framed, to which the Pope was the first to put his name,* and not only was the foundation of the college entrusted to Ignatius, but its government reserved to the direction of

* The instrument is yet preserved in the College archives.

the Society. The bull of foundation was published about the middle of the year 1552; and Ignatius laboured with incredible zeal and activity to carry it into effect. Through his efforts, a library and chapel were obtained for the college; he himself drew up a code of laws for its regulation, and a course of studies, comprising, besides theology and the Greek, Latin, and Hebrew languages, philosophy and natural science. Students began to arrive before the close of 1551. All Germany resounded with the fame of this undertaking; and two princes especially distinguished themselves as its patrons and admirers, Albert, Duke of Bavaria, who dispatched his confidential adviser to Rome to found a similar college for his dominions—although this measure does not appear at that time to have proceeded farther—and the Emperor Frederic, who sent students of great promise thither, from four several universities, and aided it with supplies of money. The calamities, however, with which, during the reign of Paul IV. the Church was visited, threatened the existence of the German college; for the cardinals being unable to continue their subscriptions, Ignatius was left alone with the burden of its support. He met the blow with an undaunted spirit, declaring that he would never desert his college. Still its misfortunes seemed rather to multiply than to decrease, until his death, in 1556, seemed to close for ever the prospect of its success. Not so, however, in the designs of Providence, for it was not till after that event that it was solidly established. Pius IV and V extended to it their protection; and at length Gregory XII (1573) issued a new decree for its foundation, fixing the number of *alumni* at one hundred; and the revenue at ten thousand sequins, to be raised partly out of the exchequer, partly upon benefices, and partly also from the Pope's privy purse.* Gregory also reformed, by a bull, (1584) the statutes of St. Ignatius, in which some modification had become necessary.† The successors of this great pontiff continued to honour the college with their patronage, and Benedict XIII, that zealous restorer of ancient discipline, was so great an admirer thereof, that he proposed its form as a model for all similar establishments, and the conduct of its members as an example to the clergy. The Emperor Ferdinand II, granted it the power of conferring degrees and privileges, similar to those enjoyed by the universities of Paris and Bologna. Thus was established the German college, which supplied Prussia, Poland, Sweden, and Denmark, with missionaries, and numbered among its convicts, one pope, (Gregory XV) eleven cardinals, fifteen bishops, and twenty-six other dignitaries of the Church, and among its alumni, fifteen cardinals, six ecclesiastical electoral princes, twenty-one prince-archbishops, twelve prince-bishops, and ninety-one suffragan bishops.

Upon the model of the German college,—whose institution was hailed with general applause, other establishments were erected, of which it was deemed the management could not be confided to better rulers than the Jesuits. Indeed, the society seemed admirably calculated for assuming the direction of the seminaries. They were peculiarly qualified to mould them according to the exigencies of the times. For it should never be forgotten, that the grand object of the seminaries of this period, besides the rekindling of fervour among the clergy, was to resist and oppose the heresy of that age. To direct them to this end, none could be better fitted than the Society, which had ever, from its origin, attacked and combated religious innovation. This constant conflict, between the Society of Jesus and Protestantism, should always be kept in view, as it serves to explain a curious moral phenomenon,—the antipathy which all the reformed creeds entertain for the very name of their opponent; as well as to unfold the deep design and high vocation of this illustrious order. 'The Society of Jesus,' says Bonald, 'came into existence at the era of the Reformation, whose fruits are only now beginning to be

* Bullar. Mag. tom. ii. p. 402. Bullar. Rom. tom. iv. par. 3. p. 259.

† Bullar. Rom. tom. iv. par. 4. p. 49. See also Cordara *Collegi Germanici et Aungarici Historia*, p. 93, 100, Rome, 1770.

estimated, against which its members have never ceased to combat. Nothing more was wanting to excite the enmity of Protestantism, as well as jealousy and rivalry in various quarters. Thus the Society, ever since its commencement, has been, like Him whose name it bears, *a sign of contradiction*; and such it will ever continue to be. But if the Jesuits have been attacked by men of talent, they have been defended by a greater number of men of talent, and even by philosophers of a different religious creed: and their advocates and adversaries are such, that they may with reason boast of the one no less than the other.* An age wherein Jesuitism is banded about as a word of reproach, with a pertinacity as odious as the vagueness and absurdity of the term is ludicrous, may learn a wholesome lesson from men who have not observed superficially, or spoken with idle declamation, and whose testimony is the more valuable, as they cannot be supposed to be biassed by religious prejudices in favour of the society. When the charge of Jesuitism was brought against Lalande, after the order had been suppressed, the philosopher burst into an eloquent lamentation. 'Humanity has for ever lost, and will never again recover' (here he was happily mistaken) 'that noble and wonderful body of two hundred thousand men, who laboured incessantly, and disinterestedly, in preaching, instructing, reconciling enemies, comforting the dying, in a word, in the discharge of all those duties, which are most sacred and dearest to the human heart. Retirement, sobriety, and self-denial, admirably fitted the society to be the depository of virtue and learning. I knew the Jesuits intimately; they were a race of heroes, heroes of religion and charity, and from religion they derived a strength that philosophy cannot supply.'† But even their greatest adversaries have not denied how excellently they were adapted to be the instructors of youth. A body, indeed, so learned, and so deeply versed in the knowledge of the human heart, could not have been otherwise. For what a number of elementary treatises, on every branch of education, making the paths of science smooth and easy to the weakest capacity, are we not indebted to the Jesuits? Nor in the highest and most cultivated regions of science and literature have they been less distinguished than in the humblest walks of knowledge. The society has produced profound philosophers and astronomers like Boscovich, mathematicians like Clavius, naturalists like Kircher, elegant scholars like Juvency, men of taste like Lanzi, learned theologians like Suarez, poets like Vanier, orators like Bourdaloue and Segneri, historians like Du Halde, Bartoli, or Pallavicini. With what incredible industry did Salmeron, Layney, and Bellarmine, apply to learning; and how early were their minds matured, so as to have acquired, at the respective ages of twenty-one, twenty-three, and twenty-five, a store of erudition capable of confounding the most subtle and experienced controversialists among their opponents. They furnished a proof, that the occupation of superintending the instruction of youth is not incompatible with even the eager pursuit of some absorbing favourite study, or one sole branch to which obedience devoted their talents. Bellarmine's noble *Controversies* were first composed for the use of the German and English students at Rome, when he was appointed their professor.

In conclusion, Sir, I have only to repeat that the friends of the Society were men illustrious for learning, wisdom, and virtue;—that their greatest enemies were men who had conspired for the subversion of religion, and who deemed the destruction of the Jesuits essentially necessary for the success of their abominable project. In a word, the devoted zeal of the Jesuits in the defence of religion was their crime, and the importance of their services the source of their suffering.

A LOVER OF TRUTH.

* *'Ami de la Religion,'* No. 2159, 26th Sept. 1833.

† *'Theiner,'* p. 55.

PROTEST AGAINST THE ORATORIO OF 'THE MESSIAH.'

—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BENGAL CATHOLIC EXPOSITOR.

SIR,—Considerable interest has lately been excited in this city by a formal Protest against the performance of *the Messiah*, in the Town Hall, for the benefit of Mr. Linton, which has been circulated most zealously through every by-lane and corner, into the house of nearly every respectable inhabitant of Calcutta. This protest bears the signatures of 32 individuals; at the head of these stand conspicuous the ministers, Senior and Junior, of the Kirk, they of St. James's, the Old, and the Free School Churches; below these, at an humble distance, and after the respectful interval of several names not reverend, follow pastors of Circular Road and Union Chapels, and Missionary ministers—thirteen. It is a curious production; and enforced thus extraordinarily upon our notice, let us bestow some notice upon it. But for the benefit of such among our country readers as situated without the pale of this *saintly influence*, may be so miserable as to be ignorant of these acts of this the First Council of the United Churches of Calcutta, transcribe we reverently the two precious paragraphs that succeed the preamble. They are as follows, barring only a change of types, and the insertion of a mark of astonishment:—

“As the performance of this Oratorio is not for a devotional end, but for the purpose of yielding entertainment, and thus securing gain; and as it THEREFORE (!) necessarily involves in it the profaning of God's most sacred name, the desecrating of His holy word, and the degradation of the Divine theme of Redemption, we, the undersigned, deem it our bounden duty to publish our solemn and united PROTEST against it; and earnestly and affectionately to entreat our fellow christians, of every denomination in this place, to abstain from giving it their countenance and support.

In taking this step, we are actuated solely by the deep conviction, that such a performance is offensive to Almighty God; and we are the rather impelled to make public this conviction, because we have reason to think that some may be led to attend it, under the impression that it partakes of the nature of a religious service.

Theologians advise that, in General Councils, though their decisions are infallible, the arguments that led to them, are not always necessarily as free from error: so, perhaps, without the imputation of profaneness, we may presume to canvass the reasonings of this Œcumenical of the United; may be allowed to deduce a few consequences from some of them; and even to impugn the Canons themselves; and this the more particularly, because as Catholics we are in one point at least, perfectly of a mind with the framers of them, that they are very far from being endowed with that Gift of the Holy Ghost which secures from error.

So then, let us begin. And, first of all, let us admire the truly Christian Charity that beams forth from, or rather the great want of it that sullies, the premises of the first Canon, which declares that the performers and the auditors of *the Messiah*, do not serve a devotional end, but go to give and receive entertainment only; as if devotion were inconsistent

with entertainment, or as if a good Christian attracted principally by expectation of entertainment from a subject so peculiarly seasonable and sublime, could not by any means feel his heart expand, his soul elevated into devotion by the recital 'of some of the most, solemn, and affecting passages that are to be found in the Holy Scriptures.' Cold indeed were the heart that could not : and so I take it that this passage is very unwarrantable, and false and most peculiarly *saint-like*. But fie upon you, Mr. Linton, you desired to '*yield entertainment, and thus to secure gain*':—here then must be the sin or the blasphemy rather; so that even though you were to hymn forth in St. Andrews, or in one of those Circular-Road-Chapels—you could not for your life fail to '*yield entertainment*,' and surely you never could be dismissed empty-handed—you would nevertheless be a most profane wretch, guilty of the triple mystified anathema of Canon No. 1. But for the same reason other, *reverend*, yielders of entertainment and '*who secure gain*' likewise, comfort yourself, are along with you. Let not *saints* talk of things not being for a devotional end,—they themselves most modestly disclaim to pass judgment on the consciences of others—and St. Paul has told us to make every action subservient to a '*devotional end*;' to rejoice always, but in the Lord; and to canticle forth his praises.

Perhaps, after all, it is *the place* that scandalizes the Protesters : the Town Hall, most assuredly, is not the most sacred of meeting-houses; greater the reason therefore that it should catch a little odour of sanctification from time to time; the Trade's Rooms have had their little share lately;—the Gospel is to be preached from house-tops even. Don't, we beseech you, good *saints*, don't limit the liberty of reciting religious themes, or of sounding them in song, to the narrow precincts of those houses whither people go to listen to *you*; or we shall be forced to surrender our comfortable '*Tea and Bible*,' of an evening, and to miss those pious rhapsodies which *devotionise* so many '*serious*' families of the Elect. Do let us enjoy our Bibles where we may choose, even though they be sung for our '*entertainment*,' and by persons too, who, like you, are *paid for it*. No doubt, you '*are actuated solely by the deep conviction that such performances are offensive to Almighty God*.' Can. 2. So then, the Dogma of Can. 1, to which are appended such dreadful anathemas, turns out in Can. II to be no more than a *conviction*! And every body knows that the *Saints* have never asserted their own infallibility even in a *deep conviction*. But, the nearer we get to the end the worse it becomes. Who could ever have imagined, that their *rather* impulse to publish such awful warnings, was their fear that some folks would mistake Mr. Linton's Oratorio in the Town Hall, for a religious service in the *Kirk* or *Chapel*; and the singer himself, in consequence, for a surpliced minister! I sincerely trust these *pious protesters* are not correct judges of men's impressions; or we must certainly be in a very early stage of enlightenment.

Reader, perhaps you have been thus far patiently expecting an argument '*on this awful subject*.' (*Preamble*.) They were thrown away against assertions containing none.

Much merriment had been called forth in the papers by this out-burst of gratuitous zeal : of all the hits, the soreest by far was that, (which is *no joke* at all) which intimated to the thirty-two signers of their precious

Protest their liability, severally, to the fine of 5000 paltry rupees, and a two-years' imprisonment; and, what is worst of all, a two-years separation from their beloved Churches and Chapels. It is presumed they are happy in the prospect; for they are *saints* and loyal, and therefore they pray that the law may have its course.

How vague, changeable and inconsistent can people be, when they deliver the law upon a point of doctrine? How clear, how constant are the decisions of the Catholic Church, which thinks the same, which speaks the same, which approves and condemns the same,—here and every where!

X. Y. Z.

Selections.

CURIOSITIES OF LITERATURE BEFORE THE PSEUDO-REFORMATION.

No. V.—Invention of Printing.

‘What would our ancestors, who lived before printing was discovered, have said, had they, after having been present in the House of Commons till two or three o’clock in the morning, read at their breakfast table a detailed account of speeches, which had occupied nearly twelve hours in the delivery, and learnt that not one or two, but many thousand copies were at that time circulating.’—*Life of Caxton.*

The infancy of printing, like the infancy of man, is interesting and instructive. We shall, therefore, without any apology, lay it before our readers, and the more readily, as it exhibits the monks as the encouragers of literature. Protestant historians and pamphleteers are so barefaced and unblushing in their assertions, and their lies have gone so long without contradiction, that we doubt not that many of our readers have been cajoled or bullied into the belief that printing is the offspring of the pseudo-Reformation; but dates, like facts, are stubborn things. The annals of typography prove that the art was born of Popish parents; that it was cradled and nursed in the lap of monks, priests, and bishops; and that it was fostered under the protection and encouragement of popes. Unable, therefore, to wrest the honour of the invention from those times, which *they* denominate dark, ignorant, and degraded, they maintain that, had not Protestantism caught it up in its arms, the infant art would have been left naked and exposed to perish; but stubborn facts will not bend. Before the close of the fifteenth century—scarcely fifty years after the invention of the art—the presses had been worked in *two hundred places*; and between the years 1455 and 1536 more than *twenty-two millions nine hundred and thirty-two thousand* volumes had issued from various presses.

It has often excited the surprise of the learned that the art of printing should not have been discovered by Greece or Rome. Anxious to support the glory and extol the excellence of classical antiquity, writers have displayed their ingenuity and indulged their fancy in showing how nearly the ancients approached to the discovery. The art of engraving, as we may show in a future number, was practised among them in great perfection. Their seals were cut in cornelian and agate with great art, and the die for their coins must have been highly finished; in fact, coining money is only printing on copper instead of on paper. Sigillan, or stamps in *creux*, or hollow for marking earthenware vessels, especially such as contained their wine, were in extensive use: the clay was stamped previous to its being baked. In the collection of the Duke of Richmond there is a sigillum, found near Rome, on which the letters are raised, similar to our metal types. It contains the name of the owner; it is two inches long and one broad;

the letters are in two rows, and behind there is a ring for the convenience of stamping. That it was used, by being dipped into ink or some coloured matter; for affixing the name of the owner to deeds or documents of parchment, is more than probable from its construction. The ground on which the letters are raised is rough and uneven, an evident proof that it could not have been used for making impressions on clay or wax, otherwise it would have left the imperfections of the ground. An apparatus used by the Emperor Justin for signing official documents approached still nearer to the art of printing, but still the secret eluded their ingenuity.

The claim of the Chinese is better supported and cannot be dismissed without comment. Clonding its origin in the obscurity of antiquity, and vainly arrogating to itself a duration of ages on ages, the Celestial Empire dates the invention of printing from time immemorial. We may safely date it from the beginning of the tenth century, 930; though others, more disposed to concede the preposterous claims of China to antiquity, suppose it to have originated 300 years prior to the Christian era. Their method of printing is by blocks of wood, the means first adopted by Guttenberg previous to the invention of moveable types. Yet to them our method would be no improvement, for, with a language consisting of only 330 words, all monosyllables, they have more than 80,000 characters or letters; hence many arrive at old age and die without having acquired a competent knowledge of all their alphabet. For them it is more easy and less expensive to cut all their letters on wooden blocks of the same size as the page: thus there are required as many blocks as there are pages, which are of no use except for a single book. This method possesses the same advantages as stereotyping, that it does not require a corrector of the press, and the same disadvantages, as the work cannot easily be improved in succeeding editions: a large room will scarcely contain the blocks for one volume. The wood of these blocks is of a smooth, firm, and close grain. On the face side is glued a paper, on which some able draughtsman or penman has traced the several letters; it is then put into the hands of the sculptor. The letters are cut in relief, and what remains of the paper is then moistened and rubbed off. Good writing is highly prized among the Chinese; hence a skilful draughtsman is always employed, for on him depends the success and beauty of the work. Few of their ancient works remain, as their paper is subject to be eaten by worms: it is made of the bark of the bamboo, by a process similar to that described in No. 1, for papyrus. Their ink is superior to any of European manufacture, but our narrow limits preclude us from entering into details, we have been thus far minute, as the subject is curious in itself, and is one which does not fall under the observation of ordinary readers.

The first step towards the invention of printing in Europe, was the printing of playing cards by blocks, towards the end of the fourteenth century. Images of saints were afterwards engraved, for which the piety of the faithful occasioned a great demand. Of the ancient books of images, the most celebrated was the *Biblia Pauperum*, or Bible of the poor; a sort of catechism, consisting of forty plates of figures, with appropriate sentences. They were stamped only on one side of the page: in fact, most ancient books were, like the Chinese, printed only on one side, and the two leaves were afterwards pasted together. The rival claims of Haerlem, Strasburg, and Mentz to the invention of the art would be as difficult to decide as those of Venus, Minerva, and Juno for the palm of beauty: we are no Paris, yet we shall attempt to award the apple to the best claimant. The claims of Haerlem and Laurence Coster may be dismissed in a few words, notwithstanding the pompous inscription on the door of the house in which Coster lived, stating that we may as soon doubt of the existence of God as of the claims of Coster. It is said that he printed with wooden types in 1430; that, whilst he was at church, his servant Gensfleisch, senior, stole his types and set up in Mentz, where he published in 1442; but these are the inventions of petty vanity, unsupported by contemporary documents. To John Guttenberg we are indebted for moveable types, cut in wood in 1443; to John Mentel for

letters cut in metal, not founded, in 1457; and to Peter Schoeffer for metal types cast in moulds in 1459. As a reward, Schoeffer received the hand of the daughter of his master, John Fust, in marriage.

Gutenberg was a native of Mentz, but his first attempt at printing was made in Strasburg in union with Mentel. A law-suit taking place, the partnership was dissolved, and Gutenberg returned poor and disappointed to Mentz. Here he entered into partnership with John Fust, a physician, who supplied the capital: but the outlay in printing a bible (1455) was so great, that they separated, and a law-suit compelled Gutenberg to give up the apparatus to Fust, who took Schoeffer, his son-in-law, into partnership.*

The first book printed with a date and title is the Book of Psalms, on vellum, in 1457; it is now in the imperial library of Vienna. The first printers were anxious to imitate MSS. as nearly as possible; hence, a space was generally left for capital letters, which were supplied by the illuminators. The early specimens are without date or title; a note, termed a colophon, was frequently added at the end of the work by the printer. The punctuation was very deficient, the orthography was varied, and the abbreviations are numerous and difficult. Most of the first books are printed on vellum, and they are remarkable for the lustre and blackness of the ink, and for the excellence of execution.† It would be an interesting task to give a history of the introduction of printing into the different kingdoms and cities of Europe, but want of space compels us to condense our matter.

Let us now examine how the new art was received by the monks. So far were they from wishing to enliven the world in mental subjection that no one rejoiced more sincerely than they did at its discovery. In fact, monasteries were the first printing offices, and monks often printed works. In the year 1474, a book was printed by the Augustin monks of a convent in the Rhingau, a diocese near Mentz, in Germany. By the rules of their order they were obliged to copy the works of the fathers and ecclesiastical writers as part of their regular duty. On the invention of printing they applied themselves to learn and practise the art. In the reign of Henry VI., Thomas Bourchier, Archbishop of Canterbury, sent Caxton to Haerlem to learn the art. By him Corsellis, an under-workman, was prevailed to come over; but it is due to the memory of Caxton to add, that this statement is contradicted. When Caxton began to practise the art, his first patrons were Thomas Milling, Bishop of Hereford and Abbot of Westminster, in which abbey he established his printing office. The first book printed by Caxton in England, was the game of chess. 'The Game and Playe of the Chesse, imprinted by William Caxton, ffynnysshid the last day of Marche, the yer of our Lord God, a thousand, foure honderd, and lxxiii.' The first printing press in Italy was in the monastery of St. Scholastica, at Subiaco, the productions of which are sought after with such avidity, on account of their extraordinary beauty. The printers were two Germans, Sweynheim and Pannartz, who had served their time under Fust and his partner: they printed the works of Lactantius in 1465. They afterwards removed to Rome, where they were encouraged by the Pope and supplied with the most valuable MSS. from the Vatican by John Andreas, the Pope's librarian. The hatred of modern Rome to

* Fust himself or his agents sold copies of this Bible at Paris, as MS., but his supply was so regular and his copies were so uniform, that he escaped the punishment of a necromancer only by declaring the secret; hence arose the story of the devil and Dr. Faustus.

† The first printed books were generally of the folio or quarto size. We meet with a few sentences in Greek type in the edition of Cicero's works at Mayence (Mentz) in 1465. The Greek grammar of Lascaris, printed at Milan in 1476, is the first book entirely Greek. At Soncino, in the Duchy of Milan, the first Hebrew work was printed in 1480; some affirm the first Hebrew work to have been printed in 1475, at Piobè de Sacco a town of Italy, in the Paduana. The Knowledge Propagation Society's Life of Caxton, unaccountably says, that Hebrew was first executed by Soncino, not at Soncino. We learn now, for the first time, that Soncino was a man.

classical literature was shown by the fact of Cicero's 'Familiar Epistles' being the first work printed there. John Mathison, patronized by the Bishop of Holun, introduced printing into Ireland in the year 1531. In the year 1480 a printing office was established in the Benedictine monastery of St. Alban, Hertfordshire, of which William Wallingford was the prior. Soon after the introduction of printing, another press was established in the abbey of Tavistock, where the printer was a monk, Thomas Ryehard. Nicholas Jenson, who introduced great improvements into the art, and who reduced to their present proportions the characters called *Roman*,* was greatly honoured by Pope Sixtus IV., who invited him to Rome in 1474, and created him Count Palatine. In 1489 a work was printed at the monastery of St. Cucufat, near to Barcelona. In 1499 a Benedictine missal and several other works were printed by Luchner in the monastery of the Blessed Virgin, on Mount Serrat, in Spain. In 1476 the works of Lactantius were printed by the priest and religious of St. Michael, at Rostock, a fortified town of Lower Saxony, in the Duchy of Mecklenburg. In 1478 printing was carried on at Sorten, a monastery of the Præmonstrants in Suevia, Germany. In 1492 we meet with a Psalter of the Blessed Virgin, printed at the Cistercian monastery of Tyennœ, in Saxony.

These facts are surely sufficient to convince any unprejudiced mind of the truth of our position, that monks were the encouragers and fosterers of the new invention of printing in the fifteenth century. Yet Protestant writers are found base enough to stigmatize and vilify the monks as hostile to it. Animated by that petty spite which prompts a street-boy to throw dirt at his companion because he has got on a better coat than himself, they meanly assail those who have a better claim than themselves to the honour of the invention.

SAGITTARIUS.

Mount Pleasant.

NEW ZEALAND.—By the kindness of a friend we are enabled to lay before our readers the following interesting letter from Baron Thierry to the Right Rev. Dr. Polding, V. A. of Australia :—' Mount Isabel, Hokianga, Feb. 4, 1838.—My dear Lord, I was much gratified by the receipt of the letter which the Right Rev. Bishop Pompallier delivered to me from you, and as sincerely grateful for such a mark of remembrance from one who, in so short an acquaintance, inspired me with so much real esteem and veneration. I found the Bishop of Maronée what you described him to be, and assure you there was something most delightfully renovating in the intercourse of a highly refined mind, after the course of vulgarity which so disgusts me in those with whom it is my fate to mingle in this still barbarous land. I grieve to say that the worthy prelate has already been the object of much persecution, and I greatly fear that he and his clergy will have much to endure before they can obtain that peace which exemplary men have a right to enjoy. Had your Lordship's recommendation been wanting, the Bishop would, as a minister of God, have had a claim to my best services; he brought me an official recommendation from the ministry of the navy in Paris, and from a gentleman in Otaheite, whose good fortune it was to befriend the persecuted ministers of your Church, who were driven thence during my residence on the island. The millennium is, I fear, yet too distant to admit of a hope that religious persecution will cease amongst Christians; it is truly cruel to see the good and virtuous,—the honest and the exemplary, insulted and scouted, instead of uniting to bring about peace on earth and good-will to all men. I am no Catholic, but what of that? Are *you* not the ministers of God? and is He not that one Great Being who absorbs the finest and purest feelings of my heart? Does it matter to me of what denomination His servants are, if they place but a single stone towards paving the road to heaven, which we unworthy mortals have so much difficulty to travel? Welcome! yes, most welcome are you

* Before this time, the *black letter* or *old Gothic* character was used; this was subsequently changed for a sort of *semi-Gothic*, which itself gave way to the *Roman* perfected by Jenson; and the celebrated printer and scholar, Aldus Manutius, is entitled to the honour of having introduced the *Italic*.

all : and may I, even at the price of the persecution which I already share for the active part which I have taken on behalf of your brother clergy, be instrumental in the establishment of any whose example and exertions may tend to better the human family.—The jealousy with which my attempt at self-government has been viewed by those, whose contracted minds can see the good of nothing that is out of the vulgar way, has made sad havoc with my infant settlement; the greater number of my people, whom I brought here at so much trouble and expense, have been seduced away from me by persons who do not scruple to give them temporary employment in the hope of injuring me. I had many more Catholics than I anticipated, but they have nearly all left, though I hope the good Bishop Maronée will prevent the ruin which their connection with immoral men might bring upon them. It would give me much pleasure to hear what are the views of your Church for these regions: there is a wide and unbroken field to the southward, where success might meet your most sanguine wishes. Perhaps I may be fortunate enough to come in for a small share of the few moments which your important duties can spare to correspondents, and I beg you to believe that none can appreciate the value of such favours better than he who begs you to believe him, my dear Lord, your's most faithfully, CHARLES BARONDE THIERRY.— P. S. I beg to be remembered to your clergy.

CHRISTMAS.

The mighty God, the Prince of Peace,
Took Flesh in Virgin's womb;
And He, whose name is Wonderful,
To this dark world is come.

The government is His, and all
The nations own his sway;
His enemies shall prostrate fall,
And vanish soon away.

A brighter star than e'er before
Gilded the sky with light,
To show the Saviour's meek abode,
Cheered the lone hour of night.

The angels tuned their harps of fire,
And from the deep blue sky,
With songs proclaimed the boundless joy
That filled the world on high.

In a stable's lowly manger
Was the Saviour laid to rest;
But his Virgin Mother fondly
Soothed and held him to her breast.

Thus the Eastern Magi found him,
And adoring at his feet,
Offered gifts of hidden meaning,
Gold, and myrrh, and incense sweet.

The gold they gave him as their king;
The myrrh means mortal grief and care
To God the censor's smoke ascends—
Emblem of faith and prayer.

Blessed Jesus! Blessed Mary!
Shield us with protecting love;
Guard our souls from sin for ever,
Take us to the world above.

A. LETHBRIDGE.

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

PRINTED BY W. RUSHTON AND CO.



